

A
PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY,

IN SEVERAL

Select Discourses

UPON THE

PRINCIPAL HEADS OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

PROTESTANTS AND PAPISTS

BEING WRITTEN AND PUBLISHED

By the most eminent Divines of the Church of England,

CHIEFLY IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES II

COLLECTED BY

THE RIGHT REV EDMUND GIBSON, D.D.

SUCCESSIVELY LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN AND LONDON,

[B. 1660, D. 1748]

CAREFULLY REVISED AND EDITED

FOR THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES
OF THE REFORMATION,

BY

THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

LONDON
PUBLISHED AT THE SOCIETY'S OFFICE,
5, ASTOR HALL, STRAND.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

JUSTLY CONDEMNED.

BOOK III.

PRAYERS IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

(CONTINUED.)

	PAGE.
The Texts examined, which Papists cite out of the Bible, for the proof of their Doctrine for Prayers in an unknown Tongue. By DR. SCOTT, late Rector of St. Giles in the Fields . . .	1

BOOK IV.

PRAYERS TO SAINTS AND ANGELS.

I.—A Discourse concerning the Invocation of Saints. By Dr FREEMAN, late Dean of Peterborough	71
III.—A Discourse concerning the Worship of the blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints. By Dr. CLAGETT, late Preacher of Gray's Inn	125
III.—The Texts examined, which Papists cite out of the Bible, for the proof of their Doctrine concerning the Worship of Angels and Saints departed. By Dr. FREEMAN, late Dean of Peterborough	218

BOOK V.

THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

- I.—The Fallibility of the Roman Church demonstrated, from the manifest Errors of the Second Nicene and Trent Councils; which assert that the Veneration and honorary Worship of Images, is a Tradition primitive and apostolical. By Dr. WHITBY, late Precentor of Salisbury 281
- II.—A Discourse concerning the Second Council of Nice, which first introduced and established Image Worship in the Christian Church, A.D. 787. By Dt. COMBER, late Dean of Durham 373



THE
WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME
JUSTLY CONDEMNED.

BOOK III.
THE CELEBRATION OF
DIVINE SERVICE IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

(CONTINUED.)

THE TEXTS EXAMINED WHICH PAPISTS CITE OUT OF
THE BIBLE, FOR THE PROOF OF THEIR DOCTRINE FOR
PRAYERS IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

PART I.

THE common pretence of the doctors of the Church of Rome against allowing to the people the use of the holy Scriptures, is their being so extremely liable to be misunderstood, and to have false and corrupt senses imposed upon them. And indeed, whosoever impartially considers the wild and extravagant senses which they themselves impose upon sundry texts of Scripture, in defence of their own unscriptural doctrines, will be very much tempted to suspect, that their design was to make instances of the truth of this their pretence, and to convince the world how liable the Scripture is to be abused, not only by the common people, but also by men of wit and learning, when once they are listed by their interest to serve a bad cause: and to strengthen this suspicion, I know no greater argument, than their vain and impotent endeavour to justify from Scripture this most uncharitable and unchristian practice of their Church, *viz.* their concealing from the people their

public offices of prayer in a language that they do not understand: to expose the vanity of which attempt, and let the world see what miserable shifts the managers of it are put to, is the design of the ensuing papers; in which I shall,

I. First, Examine the more general proofs from Scripture which they urge for it.

II. Secondly, Consider the particular texts of Scripture by which they defend it.

III. Thirdly, Produce our Scripture arguments against it.

IV. Fourthly, Answer the objections by which they endeavour to invalidate the force of these arguments.

First, I shall examine those general proofs from Scripture which they urge for it. And for this matter we seek no further than the Catholic Scripturist, and the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel, which two books are collections out of Bellarmine, and other Popish writers, of such Scripture proofs as they have pressed to serve and defend the disputed doctrines and practices of their Church, and the latter of which hath done little else than just recite the former, and this, in my opinion, with far less strength and advantage; so that when we have answered one, we have answered both.

Now as for the Catholic Scripturist, the most specious arguments which he urgeth in defence of their Latin service (and which is wholly omitted by the Touchstone) is the practice of the Jewish Church; which from the Babylonish captivity to the time of Christ, had all her Scriptures; and, as he tells us,* “all her public service and prayers (which was all taken out of the Psalms, the Law, and the Prophets) in that very language in which they were written, *viz.* in the old Hebrew; that is in the language well known indeed to the common people of the Jews before their transmigration into Babylon; but in their captivity at Babylon they lost the knowledge of their old Hebrew language, and consequently had all their Scriptures and public service read in a language unknown to the common people, and this for fourteen generations.—And this,” saith he, “before the eyes of Christ and his Apostles, and they never did in the least reprehend it.” Which argument, though it seem plausible enough at the first, I doubt not will appear, upon a more intimate inquiry, lighter than vanity: and therefore in answer to it, I shall briefly propose these four things to the reader’s consideration.

* Vid Bellarm. lib. 2. de verb. Dei cap. 15. [vol. 1. p. 64. Prag. 1721.]

First, That long before this captivity, God himself delivered the Scriptures, and consequently the public offices of prayer contained in them, to the Jews, in their native and vulgar language; for it is agreed on all hands, that the ancient Hebrew, in which God delivered to the Jews the book of the Law, the Psalms, and the greatest part of the Prophets, was before this captivity the vulgar language of the Hebrew nation; which is a much better argument that God would have the public prayers of his Church performed in a known language, than this pretended practice of the Jewish Church is, that it is all one to God, whether they be performed in a language known or unknown: for supposing it were true, that the common people of the Jews did, under this captivity, forget their old Hebrew language, and consequently that they understood not their public prayers, which were still continued in Hebrew: all this was accidental, and argues no more, than that God did permit the Jews to lose their original language, and consequently to offer up their public prayers to him in a language which they did not then understand. And what then, doth he not permit a great many things which he doth by no means allow? Notwithstanding this permission, it might, for anything that appears from it, be in God's esteem, either a great fault in their Rabbins, that they did not translate their public prayers into the new vulgar, or a great fault in the people, that they did not take care to transmit to posterity their knowledge of the old Hebrew; and perhaps it might be a fault in both. And doth it follow, that because God permitted them to be faulty, therefore he approved their fault? The question is, whether God did approve this their practice or no? And till it appears that he did, God's permission of it is a very fallacious proof of his approbation. For it is evident from the many severe animadversions our Saviour made upon the practices of that Church, that God for a long time did permit a great many corruptions in it; and for all that yet appears, this may be one of them, and a very great one too; and till such time as it is proved to be no corruption, no argument of the lawfulness of it can be fetched from God's permission. Allowing therefore the matter of fact to be true, *viz.* that the Jewish Church for fourteen generations celebrated her public services in a language that was unknown to the people, it is certain that for several generations the Roman Church had practised the same: why then may we not as well argue the lawfulness of it from the practice of the latter

Church, as of the former, and so bring the thing in question for a proof of itself; than which nothing can be more extravagant from all the laws of disputation: but this, saith our author, "was practised in the Jewish Church before the eyes of Christ and his Apostles, and they never did in the least reprehend it." Supposing this at present to be true, which (as I shall shew by and by) is notoriously false; yet even from hence there is no necessity of consequence that therefore the thing is lawful, until it be first proved, that there is nothing can be unlawful but what our Saviour or his Apostles have expressly reprehended; and this I doubt can never be proved: for how doth it appear that our Saviour reprehended every single corruption in the Jewish Church? And if he did not, it is possible that this might be one of her corruptions, though our Saviour never reprehended it; perhaps there might be some things in her worship so very absurd, as that they needed no reprehension, they being a sufficient reprehension to themselves; and among this number of things, her praying in an unknown tongue (supposing she was guilty of it) may, I think, as fairly claim a place, as most things we can imagine; so that at best this argument concludes but contingently. Had our Saviour judged this practice unlawful, it may be he would have reprov'd it, and it may be he would not, either because he looked upon it as a practice that sufficiently exposed itself, or for some other reason, which we at this distance cannot arrive to: but on the other hand, God's delivering to the Jews their public service in their native language, is an unanswerable argument, that it was his will that they should offer up their prayers to him in a language that they understood; for he did not barely permit this to be done, but he himself chose to do it, by the advice and approbation of his own all-comprehending reason, which upon full consultation of what was best and fittest to be done, determine him to inspire those prayers they used in their own language, rather than in a language that was unknown to them; and seeing all languages are alike known and easy to him, why should he choose to dictate their prayers in a known language, rather than in an unknown, had it been indifferent to him whether they prayed to him in the one or the other? To be sure, his design in giving them their prayers in their own language, and no other, was, that they should pray to him in their own language, and not in any other which they did not understand; that so understanding all along what they prayed for, their hearts might be duly affected with the matter

of their prayers ; and if this were his design, then to be sure prayers in an unknown tongue are a direct contradiction thereunto. God's giving the Jews therefore their holy prayers in Hebrew, which was then their native tongue, is as plain an argument that it was his will and intention that the people should offer up their prayers to him in a language which they best understood ; as the Church of England's publishing her prayers in English, is, that her members should from henceforth no longer pray in an unknown tongue ; and therefore, though afterwards, during their captivity, their native language was altered ; yet seeing they had no reason to apprehend that God's will and intention was altered, they ought to have pursued that, and to have translated their prayers into their own vulgar, supposing that they had lost the knowledge of their old Hebrew. They knew well enough that the reason why God first inspired their prayers in the Hebrew tongue, was not because it was Hebrew, out of any particular respect he had to that language more than to any other, but because it was their native language which they all understood ; and therefore as soon as they ceased to understand the Hebrew, those who were their guides and pastors ought to have proceeded upon God's reason, and to have translated their prayers out of Hebrew into their new native tongue ; there being the very same reason why the people should understand their prayers now when they spoke Chaldee, as there was when they spoke Hebrew. To illustrate this argument by a plain instance : the wisdom of our ancestors hath thought fit to publish our statute laws in English, for this reason, because they intended the people should so far at least understand them, as to know how to govern their actions by them. Now suppose that hereafter England (which God forbid) should be conquered by some neighbouring nation, and thereupon receive the language of the conqueror, and in process of time the common people (though continuing still under the same laws) should quite forget to speak and understand English ; in this case, if the reason of publishing the laws at first in English were good, it certainly holds as good for the translating them into the new language of England, there being the same reason why the people should understand their laws when they speak French, or Spanish, or Italian, as when they spoke English. This consideration I have the longer insisted on, because, if I mistake not, it destroys the whole force of our author's argument, supposing the whole matter of fact, from which he argues, to be true. But then,

Secondly, It is further to be considered, that it doth not at all appear, that in this captivity the old Hebrew was so universally lost as is pretended, but rather the contrary : for considering that throughout all this captivity, the Jews continued firm and stedfast to their religion, the precepts and institutions whereof were recorded in no other language but their old native Hebrew, they could not but apprehend themselves very highly concerned to preserve and continue it ; seeing without it they could have no access to their sacred oracles ; which for the conduct of their lives and actions, they had such frequent occasions to consult : for, for a nation to lose or preserve a language, which is the sole repository of the religion to which they zealously and devoutly adhere, must doubtless be very far from a thing indifferent to them ; it being impossible for men that are truly zealous for their religion, not to be very tenacious of the language in which its laws are contained, when they are to be found in no other language ; and this, as our author grants, was the case of the Jews, when they were led captive into Babylon ; whither they carried no other language with them but their native Hebrew : but then considering the strange, if not superstitious veneration which the Jews have always retained for the Hebrew, it is not to be imagined that they would easily part with it ; for they always looked upon it as the peculiar language of God, and consequently as having in it something more sacred than any other language in the world ; insomuch that they esteemed the holy Scripture itself to be much more holy in the original Hebrew, than when it was translated into another language, and that the nobility of those sacred books was very much diminished when any change was made in their language or characters :* and is it likely that they, who had so high an esteem of this language, should be remiss in their care of preserving it, especially considering that it was the only language in which the sacred oracles of their religion were contained ? This, to be sure, must necessarily render all those, who had any sense of religion, very careful and solicitous to preserve it ; and accordingly we find the Jews of all ages to be very careful in this matter. Thus Theodoret† tells us, “ Other nations have their children speaking quickly in their own mother-tongue ; but there are no children of the Hebrews, who naturally speak the

* Vid. Dr. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 803, and 804.

† Theod. in Quest. in Gen. lix. 60. [Interr. 61. p. 73. Hal. 1769.]

Hebrew tongue, but the language of the country where they were born. Afterwards when they grow up, they are taught the letters, and learn to read the holy Scripture in the Hebrew tongue." And one of their Rabbins in Pirke Avoth, tells us,* "that they taught their children the Scriptures at five years old;" that is, to read the Scripture in the Hebrew language; and to this day the Jews are very careful to teach their children Hebrew, that so they may be capable to read and understand the Scriptures; and if now they teach them Hebrew, when it is so difficult for them, the languages where they are born and bred having no affinity with it, how much more would they do it then, when it was so very easy, the Chaldee, which was the language of Babylon, being of all tongues in the world the nearest akin to the Hebrew, its letters being all the same with the Hebrew, and abundance of its words being derived from Hebrew originals, and only differing from them either in their declension or formation; what their different declensions are, the common rules of the Chaldee language declare; and as for their different formations, it consists either in changing or transposing the letters of the radical words, or in detracting from, or adding to them, or in the transmutation of the vowels; the main of all which differences are reducible to a few short and easy rules.† So that supposing the Chaldee to have been the vulgar language of the Hebrews; yet by reason of the near alliance of those two languages, they might, with as much ease, have taught their children the pure Hebrew, as the Scots can theirs to understand pure English. And is it likely that they, who are now so very careful to teach it to their children when it is so difficult, should then neglect it when it was so easy? But as for that assertion of our author, viz. that "in this captivity they lost the knowledge of their old Hebrew:" though I cannot but look upon it as a most absurd falsehood; yet I confess, in him it is very pitiable, it being his misfortune to be imposed upon by much abler heads than his own; and particularly by Bellarmine,‡ from whom he commonly borrows all his Scripture-proofs and arguments. But how far this assertion is from any probable show of truth, will, I doubt not, sufficiently appear upon a close inquiry into the matter: for considering the duration of this

* Perek. 1.

† Vid. Buxtorf. observat. Commun. Lexic. Chaldaic. prefatæ.

‡ De Verb. Dei. lib. 2. cap. 4. [ut suprà, p. 44. col. 1.]

captivity, it is hardly conceivable how in such a short space of time they should lose the knowledge of their native Hebrew (though they had industriously endeavoured it), for a native language is not soon worn out, but must pass into disuse by slow and insensible degrees : for some considerable time to be sure the generality of the people must continue to speak it, because as yet they can speak no other ; and after they have been a little initiated into a new language, they will, for a long time, be apt, where they know they are understood, to be speaking their old, that being as yet much more natural and easy to them, and so it must be a considerable time before they can be supposed to forget it. Thus when the Jews were led captive into Babylon, they carried thither no other language with them, but only their own native Hebrew ; and therefore some time after they must necessarily speak it, or live in a state of perpetual silence ; and after they had got some smattering of the Chaldee, to be sure they expressed themselves in it with a great deal of difficulty ; and therefore there is no doubt, but among themselves and in their families, they rather chose to converse in their native Hebrew, this being as yet far more familiar to them than the Chaldee ; and by commonly speaking Hebrew in their families, they could not but propagate the knowledge of it to their children. Now this captivity continuing but seventy years at most, it is probable that a great many of the first generation survived it ; and how is it imaginable that they should forget the Hebrew, which was their native language, and in which, having yet no other language, they were forced to converse for several of those seventy years ? By reason of which, the next generation, which made up a great part of those who returned from this captivity, must also be supposed to have imbibed the Hebrew from their parents ; many of whom, to be sure, especially of the ruder sort, had for several years no other language to converse in : so that supposing them to have been indifferently affected to their new Chaldee and their old Hebrew language ; yet must their seventy years captivity be elapsed, before they could be so wholly accustomed to the one, as quite to forget the other. And this will yet more evidently appear, if we consider that this very same people continued captive in Egypt for the space of 200 years ; and yet in all this long tract of time they lost not their native Hebrew, but, as all agree, brought it back along with them into the land of Canaan. And is it not very strange, that they who preserved it in one captivity of 200

years duration, should quite lose it in another of seventy, when they had all the advantages of preserving it in the latter, that they had in the former? There is no doubt but in both they intermingled their Hebrew with some words and phrases of the respective languages of those countries; and that they did so is notorious of this later captivity in Babylon, from whence they brought several Chaldee words, of which there are sundry instances in the New Testament, such as Bethesda, Golgotha, Akeldama, &c. which yet are said *Ἑβραϊστὶ λέγεσθαι*, “to be so called in the Hebrew tongue,” because by common use they were adopted into the Hebrew, even as “debauch,” “intrigue,” “embarrassment,” &c. are now adopted into the English: but yet the deriving these foreign words into them, render neither the one nor the other a new language; still the former continued Hebrew, as the latter continues English. And though perhaps every ordinary Jew understood not those Chaldee words, any more than every ordinary Englishman these French words; yet still the one understood Hebrew, as well as the other understands English. But that the Jews retained their knowledge of the ancient Hebrew under and a long while after this captivity, is evident not only from the reason of the thing, but from much better authority than can be pretended for the contrary: for the main authority which the contrary opinion depends on is that of the Jewish doctors, many of whom understood very little of their own antiquities; and though in those collections of their writings from whence these authorities are cited, it cannot be denied but that there are some things truly ancient, yet even these are so notoriously sophisticated with the inventions of their modern Rabbins, that there is hardly any relying upon them for the truth of matters of fact: and yet Barradius* quotes one Rabbi Simon, who affirms that “*nullo tempore nec scribebendi nec loquendi modus mutatus est*; that there never was any time wherein the manner of either writing or speaking Hebrew was altered.” Which, if true, was a plain argument, that in all those times the Jews had never disused themselves from speaking it; and if what Durandus† saith were true, *viz.* that “the Jews that were christened had their service in the Hebrew tongue,” it is certain that in that time the Hebrew was the vulgar language of the Jews; and that it was so even in St. Jerome’s time, at

* Barradius, lib. 5. cap. 24. [vol. 1. p. 263. col. 2. 1742.]

† Lib. 4. c. 1.

least of a great many of the Palestine Jews, is evident from that passage of his about Paula's funeral,* "Tota ad funus ejus Palæstinarum urbium turba convenit Hebræo, Græco, Latino, Syroque sermone, psalmi in ordine personabant," *i. e.* "The whole multitudes of the cities of Palestine met at Paula's funeral, and sang Psalms in order, in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syrian tongues." So that it seems in those days the Hebrew was as much the common language of some cities in Palestine, as the Greek, and Latin, and Syriac, was of others. And St. Ambrose speaking of the Jewish converts, hath this passage:† "Hi ex Hebræis erant, qui aliquando Syria lingua, plerumque Hebræa, in tractatibus et oblationibus utebantur;" *i. e.* "These were Jews, who in their sermons and oblations used sometimes the Syrian, but most commonly the Hebrew language." From whence it is evident, that Hebrew was then more common among them than the Syriac. Against all this, it is objected by Bellarmine and our author, that when the Jews returned from this captivity into their own country, Esdras "was forced by himself and others, to make the law be interpreted to them," Nehem. viii. 13. From whence they infer, that the Jews did not then understand the Hebrew tongue, in which the law was read to them. But what if by interpreting, we understand not construing the words, but explaining the sense of the law? Why truly then this doughty argument vanishes *in funem*. But that so it is, is evident from ver. 8, where it is said, that "they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading," or meaning of what they read. But still our author, from Bellarmine his oracle, objects, "that when our Saviour upon the cross, did in the old Hebrew of the Psalm say, as it was first written, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, St. Matthew, who did write his Gospel in that new kind of Hebrew the Syriac, which was vulgarly spoken by the Jews in those days, is forced to interpret these words, saying, which is being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? For which reason also he interpreted several other Hebrew words, which is a manifest sign that they could not be understood by the Jews, in whose language he did write, without interpretation." But now suppose, in the first place, that these words of our Saviour upon the cross

* Hieron. in Epitaph. Paul. [vol. 1. p. 717. Veron. 1731.]

† In 1 Cor. 11. [vol. 2. Append. p. 157. Par. 1690.]

were Syriac, and not the old Hebrew, as our author from Bellarmine will needs have them; why then it will very unluckily follow, that the Jews understood not Syriac, which yet both he and Bellarmine will needs have to be their vulgar language in our Saviour's time. For what need had St. Matthew to interpret Syriac words to the Jews, if at that time their vulgar language was Syriac? But if instead of "Eli, Eli," as it is in St. Matthew, the words of our Saviour were "Eloi, Eloi," as St. Mark reports them, the whole sentence is Syriac; and seeing the latter part is so, I should think it more reasonable to conclude the former so too, than to make our Saviour speak two different languages in so short a sentence. But suppose that for once we should be so civil as to allow the whole to be Hebrew; yet St. Matthew's interpreting it doth by no means infer that the Jews of that age did not understand Hebrew: for what if St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek, and not in Syriac, as our author affirms? Why truly then he is utterly undone again; for then all that can be inferred from St. Matthew's interpreting those Hebrew words, is, that all that understood Greek did not understand Hebrew; or at most, that there were some of the Hellenistical Jews that lived abroad in Gentile countries, who since the translation of their Scriptures into Greek (which was then the most universal language in the world) had quite forgot the Hebrew, and that for their sakes it was that St. Matthew interpreted those Hebrew words of our Saviour; either of which we may safely grant, without the least damage to our cause, or advantage to our adversaries. Now that St. Matthew did write his Gospel in Greek is the current opinion of a great many learned men, both in his Church and ours; which opinion of theirs is founded upon such arguments as, I am apt to think, will puzzle much wiser heads than his to answer: for upon the rise of the Grecian Empire, the Greek language was so far diffused through all the Eastern countries, that it became almost their universal mother-language, and particularly in Judea, where by their own Rabbins it is styled the mother-language,* it being, in all probability, the language which they ordinarily spoke when they conversed either with their brethren the Hellenists, or with foreigners, even as *Lingua Franca* is now ordinarily spoken by the natives all along the Straits, in the converse with foreigners, though it be not their

* Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 103.

native language; and from Pilate's writing the title or accusation of Christ upon his cross, in those three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, it seems very probable that they were all three very commonly understood by many, if not most of the Jews; for St. John tells us that "many of them read it, and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin:" and therefore if they read it as it was written, they read it in all those languages, and consequently understood them all; for as for the Greek, Cicero tells us, "that it was understood almost among all nations."* And St. Jerome, speaking of the Galatians, tells us, "Excepto sermone Græco, quo omnis oriens loquitur, propriam linguam, eandem habere quam Treviros;"† *i. e.* "that besides the Greek tongue, which all the East spoke, they had their own proper language, which was the very same with that that was spoken at Trevers." And as the Jews commonly spoke and understood the Greek, so they preferred it before all other languages in the world but the Hebrew, styling it "the fairest of the tongues which belong to the sons of Japhet," and affirming that "the law could not be translated according to what was needful for it into any other language but Greek."‡ Seeing therefore the Greek was so universally understood, and so highly celebrated by the Jews of that age, it is highly probable that St. Matthew, who wrote his Gospel purely for the Jews, chose rather to write it in this language than in any other, this being most universally understood by them, it being the mother-language of the Hellenistical Jews, and a language which a great part of the Hebrew Jews understood and could speak upon occasion; besides which, in most of those places which St. Matthew cites out of the Old Testament, he follows the Greek translation of the LXX, and not the original Hebrew; which in all probability he would not have done, had he written in Hebrew, the latter being of much more authority among the Jews than the former; upon which account, it would doubtless have been more advisable for him, had he written in Hebrew, to transcribe the Hebrew text, than to translate the Greek text into Hebrew. Upon these and some other reasons, a great many learned men are of opinion that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek; and if this be true, then all the sputter that Bellarmine makes

* Cicero pro Archia.

† In Proöm. 2. lib. Comment. Epist. ad Galat. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 430.]

‡ Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 103.

about his translating Hebrew words amounts to no more than this, that the Hellenistical Jews, a great part of them at least, and Gentile Greeks, did not understand Hebrew : and this, if it be worth their acceptance, we readily grant, and much good may it do them, provided always that the Hebrew Jews, who had their Scriptures in Hebrew, may be allowed to understand Hebrew ; as there is no doubt but the Hellenistical Jews did Greek, who had their Scriptures in Greek ; for then both of them must have had their service in a known tongue.

Thirdly, Supposing that after this captivity the Jews did not understand Hebrew, yet the reason why they translated not their Scriptures, wherein their public service was contained, into their new vulgar, was peculiar to themselves, and such as is by no means justifiable upon Christian principles. There was a superstitious opinion, of very ancient date, received among the divines of all religions, that some languages were in themselves more sacred than others ; and hence it was, that in their religion they retained certain names, which they called *ἄσημα ὀνόματα*, i.e. names without signification, such as Mew, Threw, Mor, Phor, Jax, Asaph, Threux, Zook, and the like ; which being borrowed from those sacred languages, they thought unlawful to translate, and so at last lost the signification of them. And Jamblichus, in answer to that question, Why, among the significant divine names they preferred these barbarous ones before their own, tells us, *Ἔστι δὲ καὶ τούτου μυστικὸς λόγος. Διὰ τὴν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἔθνων, ὥσπερ Αἰγυπτίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίων, οἱ θεοὶ τὴν ὕλην διάλεκτον ἱεροπρεπῆ κατέκειραν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰς κοινολογίας οἰόμεθα δεῖν τῇ συγγενεῖ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς λέξει προσφέρειν,* i.e.* “The reason of which matter is mystical, viz. because the gods do esteem the languages of the sacred nations, such as the Egyptians and Assyrians, to be wholly sacred ; and therefore we conceive that our discourses with the gods ought, as much as may be, to be performed in these sacred languages, which are so near akin to them.” Where under the Assyrians he includes Jews, who had such an high opinion of the sacredness of their own above all other languages, that, as our learned Lightfoot observes,† it is disputed by them, whether it be lawful to snatch the holy books out of the fire on the Sabbath-day, when it cannot be done without some labour ; and it is concluded, without all scruple, that if they be wrote in Hebrew,

* De Myst. Sect. 7. cap. 4.

† Vol. 2. p. 801.

they ought to be snatched out ; but if in any other language or character, it is doubted : and Rabbi Jose affirms they are not to be snatched out, nor would they tolerate, as he there observes, the version of the book of Job in the Chaldee language, much less the version of the Law and the Prophets into any more remote and heathen language. This therefore was one reason why they were so shy of translating their Scriptures into any other language, because they looked upon all other language as too profane to express their sacred oracles. As for the Hebrew, they tell us that it is *Lingua divinitus creata, et omnium perfectissima, et rebus ipsis convenientissima* ; and that *Angeli majorem ejus rationem habent quam aliarum*,* that it is a language of God's creating, and of all others the most perfect, and agreeable to the nature of things ; that the angels themselves have a higher veneration for it than for any other ; and upon this superstitious apprehension, they looked upon it as a kind of profanation of the holy books to translate them into any other language : which is such a reason as cannot, with any modesty, be pretended by the Romanists against our translating the Scripture into vulgar languages, and much less against having our public prayers in a known tongue ; for sure they will not pretend, either that their Latin is a more sacred language than another, or that their prayers, which are for the most part of human composure, are too sacred to be expressed in vulgar languages.

But then the other and main reason why the Jews were so averse to the translating their Scriptures out of Hebrew, was, that they looked upon the Scripture as their own proper treasure ; by being possessed of which, they thought themselves advanced to a higher pitch of glory than any other nation, and therefore they could not endure to think of communicating it to the heathen, whom they despised and abominated ; they looked upon it as a high profanation of the sacred mysteries, to expose them to the view of the Gentile world, and to cast such precious pearls before such unclean swine, as they esteemed all nations but their own. And therefore when they were forced against their wills, by Ptolemy Philadelphus, to translate their Scriptures into Greek, that day they accounted as bitter unto Israel as the day wherein the golden calf was made, and for a long while after they kept

* Lib. Cofri p. 4.

an annual fast to bewail that work of the translation ; and in the translation itself they used an unpricked Bible, in which the words being written without vowels, they might the better distort them divers ways, and into different senses from the original ; and if they were questioned, might point them so as to make them agree with their false translation ; by which means they industriously concealed a great deal of the true sense of their Scriptures from the Gentiles. But how unjustifiable soever this reason might be in the Jews (who were the peculiar people of God, inclosed by the laws of their religion from all sacred communication with any other nations, and with whom the Gentile world was legally unclean), to be sure now the middle wall of partition is broken down, and the Gentiles received into free participation of all the privileges of the Church of God, no Christian Church or people can pretend to it ; and unless the learned part of the Church of Rome, who understand Latin, can advance the same pretence that the Jews did, *viz.* that they are the peculiar people of God, and that all illiterate Christians are to be looked upon and treated as unclean heathens, and strangers and aliens to the commonwealth of their Israel, it will doubtless be highly impious, as well as uncharitable, for them to pretend to act upon this Jewish reason. Seeing therefore the Jews, in not translating their Scriptures, acted upon such reasons as no Christian people can pretend to, their example can be no warrant for any Christian Church to follow them : for it is the reason of human actions that either justifies or condemns them ; and therefore, though we should suppose these Jewish reasons to be just and good in their state and circumstances, yet this can be no warrant for any Christian Church to act upon them, unless its state and circumstances were the same : but if the state of all Christian Churches be in both these respects directly contrary to that of the Jewish ; that is, if all their languages are equally holy, and all the people that speak them are equally entitled to the privileges of the Church of God, then the same reasons that obliged the Jewish Church to do as they did, oblige all Christian Churches to do the contrary ; and consequently, the same reasons which obliged the Jewish Church not to translate her Scriptures and divine offices out of Hebrew into other languages, do equally oblige the Roman Church to translate her Scriptures and divine offices out of Latin, into the vulgar languages of all other Churches in communion with her : and thus their mighty argument recoils

upon themselves, which is all that men usually get by endeavouring to colour their foul practices with false pretences.

Fourthly and lastly, That supposing that after this captivity the Jews did not understand the Hebrew ; yet, whenever their Scriptures and divine offices were read to them in Hebrew, they had them always interpreted to them into their vulgar languages. After the Hebrew ceased to be the vulgar language of the Hebrew Jews, which in all probability was long after the days of our Saviour and his Apostles, they still continued in their synagogues to read the Scripture to the people in the original Hebrew ; the understanding as well as speaking of which being in process of time in a great measure lost among the vulgar, they appointed in all their synagogues an interpreter, who being skilled in the tongues, was to stand by him that read the law, and to render, verse by verse, what was read out of the Hebrew into the mother-tongue ; concerning which interpretation there were sundry and accurate canons made by their doctors ; as particularly this, “ He that reads in the law, let him not read at one time more than one verse to the interpreter,” for which they give this reason, “ lest the interpreter mistake.” By which practice of theirs it is evident, that though for the above-named reasons they were very averse to the translating their Scriptures out of the Hebrew, yet they looked upon it as absolutely necessary in their public worship for the people to hear them in their mother-tongue, that so they might both understand God’s will from his own word, and be able to join with understanding in those Scripture-prayers and thanksgivings of which their public worship did consist. Which practice of theirs effectually condemns the practice of the Church of Rome, which never takes any care to interpret her Latin prayers to the people, though the far greatest part of them understand Latin no more than the Jewish vulgar in those days did Hebrew ; and therefore it is very impertinent in the Roman doctors to urge this example of the Jews in the vindication of their Latin service ; for if the example were good, they are obliged to follow it in one part as well as another ; nor will it at all justify them, that the Jews as well as they read their public prayers to the people in an unknown tongue, unless they, as well as the Jews, interpret their prayers to the people in their mother-tongue, which I doubt would be a task too big for the skill of many a mass-priest ; among sundry of whom, if I am not misinformed by their own authors, Latin is a very scarce commodity, insomuch that the

priest understands no more what he reads than the people what they hear, and so "the blind lead the blind!" God avert the consequence.

And now by this time I think I may presume upon it that I have given a full and satisfactory answer to this so much celebrated argument of our authors; upon which I have the longer insisted because I find it so often repeated by their writers, and so little taken notice of by ours. And if after they have given us so many dishes of their twice twenty times boiled coleworts, there be any remaining reason to expect from them a modester usage for the future, I would very fain hope, that before they repeat this argument again, they will think themselves obliged to return some fair reply to this answer.

II. I now proceed, in the second place, to consider particularly those texts of Scripture which they urge in defence of their Latin service. And the only texts insisted on, either by the Catholic Scripturist, or Touchstone, after the most diligent inquiry they could make among their own authors, are Levit. xvi. 17, and Luke i. 8. In the first of which it is said, "Let no man be in the tabernacle when the high-priest goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out and hath made an atonement for himself and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel." In the second we are told, that while Zacharias "executed the priest's office before God, his lot being to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord, the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense." But what consequence, I beseech you, can be drawn from hence to justify the use of public prayers in an unknown tongue? "Why," saith the Scripturist, "see you not here public prayers made expressly for the whole assembly; and yet none of the assembly permitted to hear or see what there was done by the priest to God for them, even then when the priest made an atonement for himself, his household, and all the congregation of Israel!" And then saith the Touchstone, "All the people were without, and the priest within; how then did they understand him? therefore the public service of the Church may be said as all the people understand it not." But what most wretched consequence this is, will, I doubt not, sufficiently appear upon these following considerations.

I. That it doth not appear that in the performance of this sacred office there was any vocal prayer used, either by the high priests on the great day of expiation, or by the priest in

the morning and evening incense. The Scripturist, by falsifying the words of Levit. xvi. 17, would fain insinuate that the high priest, when he went into the holy of holies, offered up some public vocal prayer there for the people; for instead of "Let no man go into the tabernacle of the congregation when the high priest goeth in to make atonement in the holy place," he reads, "When the high priest goeth in to pray for himself and his house," &c. From whence he infers, "See you not here public prayer made expressly for the whole assembly?" &c. Whereas in reality there was no public prayer made either by him or by the priest during the celebration of these sacred rites; all that the high priest did during his abode in the holy of holies (into which he entered with a censer of coals in one hand, and a dish of incense in the other), was offering the incense, and sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices. When he offered the incense he entered in with a censer of coals in one hand, and a dish of incense in the other. with which he went up to the ark; and there having set down his coals, he emptied the incense into his hands and laid it on the coals; and having staid there till the room was full of smoke, he returned backwards from within the vail with his face still towards the ark. But all this while we do not find that ever he spoke one syllable; it is true when he was come out of the holy of holies, the Hebrew doctors tell us, he made a short prayer; but this he pronounced so audibly that the people heard him, and were thereby satisfied that he was not dead in the temple;* and then when he went in again with the blood of the sacrifice, all that he did was to sprinkle it eight times, once upwards, and seven times downwards, between the bars of the ark, and so he returned as before, without offering up one syllable of public prayers. It is true, at the killing the sacrifices, both for himself and for the people, he made a public confession, both of his own and the people's sins; but this he performed in their presence and hearing. And in the close of the solemnity, he offered up eight several prayers; but this he also performed before the whole congregation. So that all the public prayers he offered were made in the sight and hearing of the people, that so they might all join with him, which is a much better argument that all public prayers ought to be performed in the sight and hearing of the people, and neither muttered in a low voice so that the people cannot hear them, nor pronounced in an unknown tongue, so as that they were as good not hear

* Vid. Maimon. jom. Hakipparim, c. 4. sect. 1.

them; then the high priest's retiring from the sight of the people in the performance of those sacred rites is, that the public prayers may be lawfully so performed as that the people cannot understand them, which indeed is no argument at all, seeing in the performance of these sacred rites no public prayers were used.

And then as for the priest's offering the daily incense, the manner of it was thus, as the Hebrew doctors inform us. After the ashes were gathered from off the altar by one priest into a golden vessel, another brought a vessel full of incense, and a third a censer with fire, and put coals upon the altar; upon which these three bowed themselves and went out; and then a fourth, whose office it was to burn the incense, upon warning given by the president, strewed it on the fire; at which all the people withdrew out of the temple from between the porch and the altar, and fell to their prayers; and then when the priest had burnt the incense, he bowed himself and went his way.* In all which account there is not the least syllable of any public prayer that was offered by him. It is true, his offering the incense was a symbolical prayer, signifying his offering up the prayers of the people by way of intercession; but this, as I shall shew by and by, was peculiar to his office; and the people having no part in it, it was no way necessary they should be present at it; but if they had had their part in it, they could as easily join with him when they saw him not as if they had seen him; for they knew as well what he was doing as if they had been present with him; they certainly knew that when the president gave the signal, "Sir, offer," he immediately strewed the incense on the coals, and therewithal offered up their prayers unto God. For sure a common symbol of every day's use is much more easy to be understood by illiterate people than a Latin prayer; the action spoke as plain to them, and was as well understood by them as their mother-tongue; they saw their priests carry the coals and incense into the holy place, and they knew it was in order to offering it up to God for them; they heard the president command the priest to offer, and thereupon did as certainly know that he offered it, as if they had seen him do it. So that their not seeing him do it, did not at all obscure the meaning of that sacred rite from them, as an unknown tongue must necessarily do the meaning of the prayers expressed in it;

* Vid. Maimon, of the Daily Service, cap. 3.

and therefore unless it can be proved that it is as easy for our people to understand Latin prayers as it was for the Jews to know that their priest was offering incense, and what he intended by it, though they saw him not, it will be a mighty wide arguing from the one to the other, though we should suppose the Jews to be as much obliged to join with their priests in that symbolical prayer as we are with ours in our vocal prayers. The Jews did not see their priest when he offered the incense, but yet very well understood what he was doing ; therefore we who see our priest when he offers our prayers, need not understand what he prays for. Or thus, the Jews saw not this symbolical prayer of their priest, which yet they understood as well as if they saw it ; therefore our vocal prayers may be lawfully read to us by our priests in an unknown tongue, which we do not understand at all. A wonderful wise consequence this, and such as very well becomes such logicians as think themselves bound to say something, even when they can say nothing to the purpose.

2ndly, That the symbolical prayer expressed by this sacred action of the priest was peculiar to himself, and the people had no part in it ; for it is agreed among all Christians that both the high priests and priests in these sacred performances were types and figures of Jesus Christ, and that particularly in their offering the incense they did prefigure his intercession for us ; wherein he offers up our prayers to his Father, perfumed and hallowed by his meritorious sacrifice, in which it was impossible for the people to bear any part, they being the party interceded for ; and seeing the priests only, and not the people, were appointed by God to represent by this sacred action our Saviour's intercession for us, it had been a degree of sacrilege in the people to assume any part in it ; and seeing they had no part in it, what need had they to be present at it ? No more sure than we have to be present with our Saviour at the right hand of his Father, while he is there making intercession for us. But doth it follow that because the Jews were not allowed to be present at the incense-offering, in which they had no part, therefore we Christians are not allowed to be present at the public prayers of the Church, in which we have all our parts ? No ; this our adversaries will by no means allow. And yet this, I think is a much better consequence than that of our wise author's, *viz.* "Therefore the people need not understand those prayers," seeing it is to no purpose for them to be present at prayers which they do not understand. But the people did not see what the priest did when he offered the incense ; and

what then? Why then they did not understand what he did. Suppose they did not (which, as I shewed before, is notoriously false), doth it follow that because they understood not what the priest did when he offered the incense, in which they had no part at all, therefore we need not understand the public prayers which the priest reads, in which we have all our parts, and are obliged to join? Or, that because the Jewish priest did not permit the people to see the incense-offering, which was an office peculiar to the priesthood; therefore the Christian priests need not permit the people to understand the public prayers, which are the common office of all Christian people? Dare any of our adversaries affirm that Christians are no more obliged to pray with their priests in the public prayers of the Church than the Jews were to offer incense with their priests in their incense-offerings? No; though we know they are daring enough at a bold assertion; yet this I am apt to think they have hardly the confidence to adventure on. Well then, how doth it follow that Christians are not obliged to understand what they are obliged to act in? Because the Jews were not obliged to understand what they were not obliged to act in. Which is as much as to say, because I need not understand that which I have nothing to do with, therefore there is no necessity I should understand that which is my duty.

3rdly, That the reason why, in this sacred action, the high priest and priests withdrew from the sight of the people, was wholly mysterious and typical, and as such is not to be urged in vindication of Christians praying in an unknown tongue. For as the high priest and priests were in this act types and representations of our Saviour interceding for us, and offering up our prayers, so the holy and most holy place where they performed this act were types and representations of heaven where he intercedes. The truth of which is so universally owned among Christians that I need not insist upon the proof of it. The true reason, therefore, why these Jewish priests, in their incense-offering, withdrew from the sight of the people into the holy and most holy place, was to represent our Saviour's withdrawing himself out of the sight of this lower world into the heavenly place, when he ascended thither to intercede for us at the right hand of God. Supposing then that the Jewish people did not understand what their priest did while he was offering the incense, because they did not see him, yet this will by no means justify the Christian priests in not permitting the people to understand what they say when they offer up the

public prayers, unless they can pretend to have the same reason to conceal the prayers from the people, by expressing them in an unknown tongue, that the Jewish priests had to conceal the incense-offering from their people, by performing it in the holy or most holy place. And this, I think, without disparaging the confidence of our adversaries, they have not yet forehad enough to pretend to. For sure their priests were never intended for types and shadows of our Saviour; or if they were, their reading mass was never meant to typify the intercession of our Saviour; or if it were, yet their reading mass in an unknown tongue was never designed to represent our Saviour's ascension into heaven to intercede for us there. Why then do they pretend to justify this practice of theirs by the example of the Jewish priests, when they have not the least shadow of pretence to the reason upon which they acted? Suppose we should be so civil as to grant them, that offering the incense out of the sight of the people, and offering public prayers in an unknown tongue were parallel cases (which I am sure is much more than they can justly demand), yet how doth the one justify the other? The Jewish priests offered the incense out of the sight of the people upon this reason, because God required them thereby to prefigure the ascension of our Saviour into heaven, there to offer up our prayers to his Father. What then, I beseech you? Why then the Christian priests may lawfully offer up the public prayers in an unknown tongue. Say you so, beloved! what, whether they have the same reason or no? Yes, yes, reason or not reason, that is all one. I confess by this way of arguing, one would think so: but hitherto men always fancied that the reason of the law was the law; and that when the lawgiver took away the reason, he took away the law with it. But our sage authors, it seems, are resolved upon it that the law shall stand in despite of the reason. I must needs say, if the Jews do not thank them for this resolution, they are very ungrateful people, seeing it as well establishes their whole ceremonial law, as this.

4thly, That during the time of this sacred action the people had their prescribed prayers for themselves in a language which they understood. So the text tells us, Luke i. 10, that "the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense." And in the 50th of Ecclesiasticus, the whole order of this action is thus described: "The high priest Simon, the son of Onias, offering to God the odour of sweet smell, the sons of Aaron cried out and sounded with trumpets, then all the people together made haste and fell on

their faces to the ground, and besought the Lord most high in prayer before the merciful, until the ministry of the Lord were done," *i. e.* the incense consumed, "and then Simon descending," *i. e.* from the sanctuary, "lift up his hands over all the congregation of Israel, to give the Lord's blessing." From whence it is plain that while the incense was offering the people had their own peculiar prayers appointed them; and what they were the Hebrew doctors acquaint us, *viz.* three, which they recite, and call "the people's prayers."* All which prayers being collects of a considerable length, must in all probability be indited in a language which they well understood, otherwise, as they must have prayed for they knew not what, so it had been next to impossible for them to have recited their prayers truly, which was a circumstance upon which the Jews did nicely (if not superstitiously) insist in all their public offices. So that this argument of our author's from the incense-offering, if they do not handle it more cautiously, will go near to cut the throat of their own dear cause. For first, it was no wonder at all that the people were not permitted to be present with the priest in his incense-offering, seeing at the same time they had their peculiar offices of prayer appointed them. They were to be praying without in the court of the Jews, which, together with that of the Gentiles, represented the lower world, while the priest was offering within the sanctuary, which represented the upper world; the design of which was to represent and shadow forth the Christian Church sending up its prayers to heaven from this lower world, whilst Jesus, her high priest, is offering them up to his Father in the heavenly sanctuary. But had the Jewish priest on the one hand, been present with the people in their court without, he could not have represented Jesus interceding for his Church in heaven; or had the people being present, on the other hand, with the priest in the sanctuary, they could not have represented the Christian Church sending up her prayers from earth to heaven. So that the nature of this whole mystical action was such as did require the priest and people to be apart while they were performing their respective offices. But, I beseech you, what mystical office have Christian people in the public prayers that can render it as necessary for them not to understand the prayers, as it was for the Jewish people not to be present at the incense-offering? None at all that ever I could hear of, so much as fancied or

* Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 946, 947.

pretended to. The Jewish people were obliged by the very part they acted in this sacred solemnity to be in a separate place from the priest; and therefore till it be proved that Christian people have some part allotted them in their public worship that equally obligeth them not to understand the language of their prayers; to infer the lawfulness of the latter from the former is just as good logic as, the stick stands in the chimney corner, therefore it must rain to-morrow.

But then, secondly, It is further observable, that there was no other vocal prayer used in this sacred solemnity but what the people understood; seeing it is evident not only that they understood Hebrew in our Saviour's time (as was proved before), which was the language in which their prayers were indited; but also that it had been extremely difficult for them truly to have recited three such long collects, and utterly impossible to have accompanied the matter of them with their devout desires and affections (as was just now observed), had they not understood the language in which they were expressed. And if this be so, then this Scripture instance, which our authors urge in their own vindication (if it be considered in all its circumstances), argues point blank against them; for then it will follow from it, that though it be not necessary that the people should be admitted to see, and (which is more than I need allow) to understand every mystic action of the priest (such as was that of the incense-offering); yet it is necessary that they should understand the prayers in which they are obliged to join.

And thus, I think, I have sufficiently answered our adversaries' texts, which at first view do evidently appear so far from their purpose, that their urging them is a plain demonstration what a miserable shift they are put to for Scripture proof to justify this absurd and unscriptural practice of their Church. For certainly, could they have sheltered it under any fair colour of Scripture, they would never have lodged it in such a deplorable refuge, which, instead of defending it, doth only more expose it.

But there is one text more urged by the Scripturist, which he mentions so faintly, that it is plain his intent was rather to flourish than to fight with it. which I suppose was the reason why his modest transcriber, the Touchstone, left it out of his copy. The text is Matth. xxi. 16, where, when the children cried out in the temple, Hosanna to the Son of David, "though they knew not what they said," saith our author, "yet Christ called it a perfect praise, saying, that Out of the mouths of

infants and sucklings thou hast perfected praise." But what makes our author so confidently affirm, that "they knew not what they said?" Is it because the text calls them children? However, it is plain they were such children as could go to the temple, and consequently could speak, and understand what they spoke. Or, is it because Hosanna is an Hebrew word, which language, as our author will have it, was not understood by the common people, and much less by the children? Suppose this were true (though we have largely proved the contrary), yet why might not those Hebrew children as well understand the meaning of Hosanna as ours do of Amen, which is an Hebrew word as well as that? Hosanna was a word of that common use, that they called the bundles of boughs, which they carried about in the feast of tabernacles, Hosannas; Hosanna, *i. e.* "save, I beseech thee," being the form of acclamation which the Jews were wont to use in the celebration of that feast, and it being the manner of the Jews, as our Lightfoot observes,* to teach their children from their infancy how to manage those bundle of boughs, and in their waving them to cry Hosanna, it is very fairly supposable that they did as well understand the meaning of the word (allowing that they did not understand Hebrew) as our catechised children do the meaning of Amen.

And now seeing our author is so unfortunate as not to be able to make out his point by Scripture, he is resolved to try what he can do by illustration; for so he gravely tells us, that† "a petition well made, even when it is presented by a petitioner, who understands not the language in which the petition is made, obtains of the king, or emperor, who understands it, as much as if the petitioner had perfectly understood every word of it. Even so," &c. But now suppose this king, or emperor, should ask this petitioner: Friend, do you know what it is here you petition for? And he should answer, No, indeed, and it shall please your majesty, I confess I do not understand one syllable of what is therein contained; whether it be for pardon for some fault, or protection from some danger, or for some particular place of preferment, I do not know; only this I am informed by those that do understand it, "that it doth contain a particular praise of your majesty,"‡ (they are our author's own words, with the necessary variations) "and a special worship or honour to your per-

son, and a peculiar recommending of my necessities to you ; and that it is a very decent petition, approved by the company of petition-makers, and recommended by all the learned of that faculty, who very well understand it," though I do not. I strongly fancy, that how gracious soever our supposed king or emperor may be, he would conclude such a petitioner to be either a very rude fellow, that came with a design to mock him, or a very silly and impertinent one, and treat him accordingly : even so, &c. But we have choice of illustrations ; and therefore seeing this will not do, let us try another : "A rich jewel (as our author* proceeds) in the hands of an infant or clown, who knows not to penetrate the value of it, doth not for that cause cease to be truly of as great value, as when it is in the hands of a great jeweller : so Latin prayers in the mouths of the vulgar, be as precious in the sight of God (when they be said with equal devotion), as when they are in the mouths of great scholars." Very pretty indeed ; but one misfortune is, that this precious jewel is stolen goods, filched word for word from Antoninus.† And then there is another worse than this ; that when all is done, it is not worth stealing : for as I take it, there is a great deal of difference between a good prayer and a precious jewel. A jewel is never to be rendered more or less precious to another, by any act of my mind ; nor will my desire, or hope, or love, raise the price of it ; and whether it be in my hand, or mouth, or pocket, its value is the same. But surely it is not thus with a prayer, the intrinsic value whereof principally depends upon the devotional acts of the mind. There is no doubt, but the same prayer is much better, in God's esteem, when it is inspired with our faith and hope, desire and love, than when it is only written in a book, or read or heard with a cold indifferency ; and I cannot but think, that a good prayer is much more acceptable to God, in a devout man's mouth, than in his pocket, provided he understands it, attends to it, and joins his affections with it ; without which, it is every whit as acceptable in his pocket as in his mouth : for a form of prayer, while it hath none of those devotional acts of the mind joined to it, is only the mere carcase of a prayer, without the soul that animates and enlivens it ; and he who recites it without exerting with it any mental act of devotion, doth say a prayer indeed, but he doth by no means pray. But how can a man exert these devotional acts

* P. 163.

† Sum. Part 3. Tit. 23.

in a form of words which he doth not understand? How can he pray in faith when he knows not what he is to pray for? How can he confess his sins with sorrow and remorse of soul, when he confesses he knows not what? How can he desire or hope for the particular blessings which the prayer contains, when he knows not what they are? How can he cordially praise or give thanks, when he knows not either what it is that he praises, or what it is that he gives thanks for? Or, how can he know when to confess, or when to petition or give thanks, when he knows not whether the prayer that is reading be a confession, a petition, or thanksgiving? And then how is it possible for him to attend to a prayer which he doth not understand? He may attend indeed to the sound and figure of the words, but not to their sense and meaning. And if this be all that is required, a parrot may be as duly attentive as a Christian: so that all those devotional acts which constitute a form of prayer an actual prayer, are under the direction of the understanding; without which they cannot be exerted. But how can the understanding direct these acts, in a form of prayer which it doth not understand? How can it direct our sorrow or hope, or desire or gratitude, to go along with the prayer, when it knows not what sins they are that the prayer confesses, or what blessings they are that it asks, or returns thanks for? Though our author's jewel be every whit as precious in the hand of one that understands it not, as of one that understands it; yet, by his leave, it is far otherwise in a prayer. It may be as good a form of prayer indeed in the one hand, as in the other; but by no means so good a prayer, or so precious and acceptable in the sight of God. The Lord's Prayer written upon a label, coming out of the mouth of our great grandfather's statue, kneeling on his monument, with his hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, is as good a form of prayer as when it is pronounced from the mouth of a devout soul, with the highest raptures of zeal and fervour. But sure no man can think it to be as good a prayer; indeed, from the one's mouth it is no actual prayer at all, but only a dead form of prayer; for how can that be an actual prayer, which is not actually prayed? But from the mouth of the other, it is an actual, living, animated prayer, which is sure to find acceptance with God. And I doubt the case is near the same, between a prayer from the mouth of one that understands it not, and one that understands it; from the one it is not so much a prayer, as a form of words containing

matter of prayer; for unless he desires the matter contained in this form of words, he cannot be said to pray for it; but how is it possible he should desire it, when he knows not what it is? He may indeed exert a general undetermined devotion while the words are saying; but it is impossible for him to determine his devotion to the matter and meaning of the words, because he doth not understand it. So that a Latin prayer from one who understands not Latin, can be no more than a form of prayer, because he can only say it, but cannot pray it: and therefore when our author tells us, "that Latin prayers, in the mouths of the vulgar, be as precious in the sight of God (when they be said with equal devotion), as when they are in the mouths of great scholars;" he supposes that which is not to be supposed (if by devotion he understands the devotion of the mind), *viz.* that he who understands not Latin, may pray over a Latin prayer with equal devotion with him who understands it; which is impossible, seeing a man can no more pray a prayer of which he doth not know the meaning, than sing a tune of which he doth not know the measures: he may say over the words indeed with equal outward devotion with him that understands them, but he cannot accompany them with equal devotion of mind, nor indeed with any at all; for how can his mind go along with words of which he doth not know the meaning? Such words can signify nothing to the mind; and therefore the mind can attend to nothing in them, unless it be in their sound and figure; which, I am apt to think, were never intended to be the subject-matter of our inward devotion, though there are writers of great name in the Roman Church, of a quite contrary opinion.

For Suarez tells us, that "it is not essential to prayer to think particularly of what he says, and that it is not necessary to think of the things signified by the words." But I am not able to imagine, either how a man can desire a thing which he doth not think of, or how he can pray for a thing which he doth not desire.

But yet he goes on to tell us, that "it is not necessary to the essence of prayer, that he who prays should think even of the speaking of the prayer."* So that it seems a man may pray when he thinks neither of the words nor meaning of his prayer; and if so, I see no reason why our great-grand-

* De Orat. l. 3. c. 4.

father's statue, as before described, may not as truly be said to pray, as our great-grandfather himself.

Cardinal Tolet indeed tells us, that "to attend to the words, so as not to speak them too fast, or to begin the next verse of a psalm, before he that recites with you hath done the former verse, is necessary."* And this indeed disables the reverend statue from performing what is necessary to prayer. However, a well-taught parrot, according to his doctrine, may pray very devoutly. For, as he goes on, "there is an attention, which is by understanding the sense, and that is not necessary" (therefore say I, so far as it is necessary, parrot, you pray very well), "for if it were, very few would do their duty, when so very few do understand what they say." We may thank your prayers in an unknown tongue for that. "But then," saith he, "there is an attention relating to the end of prayer, that is, that he who prays, considers that he is present before God, and speaks to him, and this indeed is very profitable, but it is not necessary:" why truly then, our devout parrot must content himself with the necessities of prayer, and not aspire to "this very profitable part of it." And even our own soft and smooth Representer tells us, that "it is not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of prayers, but rather purely on God."† Why truly then, in my opinion, they were better use no words at all in their public prayers. For doubtless, their minds would be better able to attend upon God in a deep silence, than in the noise and clatter of a company of words, of which they do not know the meaning.

But after all, our author hath reserved (as he imagines) a very stinging period for the close: "You who scorned (saith he) to use Latin service, soon come to see your English service with all scornful contempt banished out of almost all your churches; and your people did soon grow to like no service at all, since they misliked the Latin service." But there is a late book, called "Foxes and Firebrands," that could have furnished our author with a quite different account of this matter, *viz.* that it was not the setting forth our service in English, that made our people contemn and reject it; but the knavish practice of the Jesuits and other seminary priests, who, to divide our people from the Established Church, assumed the disguise of zealous Protestants (which by the way was some-

* Instruct. Sacr. [Lib. 2.] C. 13. N. 3. [5.] 6. [p. 289, 290. Colon. 1621.]

† Page 62.

thing knavish), and therein, contrary to their own belief and persuasion, took all opportunities to preach down set forms of prayer and ceremonies, which I cannot but think was very knavish, or at least a sufficient evidence (if there were no other), that the Jesuit's morals do allow them not only to tell lies, but to preach lies to heretics, if it be with an intention to serve their Catholic cause. For they were authorized to preach this doctrine (though in their own consciences they believed it to be false), not only by a licence from their own society, but also by a bull of Pius V. And from these prevaricating preachments of their own emissaries (as we have too much reason to believe), sprang all that "scornful contempt" in the minds of our credulous and unwary people, which "at length banished our English service out of almost all our churches."

But we have now some reason to hope, that our scornful contemnners will at length remember, that there is a certain being in the world, that hath too many children of his own temper, whom neither they nor we have any great reason to dote on; whose common practice is to tempt men to sin, and then to expose and accuse them for it.

PART II.

III.—I now proceed, in the third place, to shew what Scripture arguments we have against public prayers in an unknown tongue; which is so very absurd in itself, and so plainly repugnant to all the ends of Divine worship, that if we had not one word of Scripture against it, the reason of the thing would be sufficient to justify our opposition of it to all unprejudiced minds. But besides this, we have as plain and express Scripture against it, as we could have well expected, had it been the design of those Scriptures to oppose and condemn it. For,

1st, The Scripture makes it necessary for our understanding, so far as it is capable, to concur with our wills and affections in all that worship we render to God, which it is impossible for it to do when we worship him in an unknown tongue. Thus the Psalmist, "God is the King of all the earth; sing ye praises with understanding."* But when those hymns of praise that are to be sung in the public worship, are in a lan-

* Psal. xlvii. 7.

guage the people do not understand, how can they sing praises with understanding? And accordingly St. Basil, in answer to that question, What is it to sing with understanding? tells us, "That understanding, when it refers to the words of the holy Scripture, is the same thing as the taste is to meats; for as the throat, by tasting, discerneth meats, so the mind doth words: if therefore a man be so affected in his soul by the force of every word he sings, as the taste is affected with meats, he hath fulfilled the commandment, which saith, Sing ye praises with understanding."* But how is it possible for the mind to taste and relish words, which it doth not know the meaning of? By these words, saith Theodoret, "The Psalmist instructs us, not only to employ the tongue in singing of our hymns, but to stir up the mind to understand the things that are spoken."† But we may stir our hearts out before we can understand them, when they are spoken to us in an unknown tongue. "To sing with understanding," saith Athanasius, "is so to sing, as that there is a spiritual harmony between the soul and the words; and they who sing after such a manner, as to join the symphony of the spirit with the melody of the words, singing with the tongue, and also with the mind, do greatly advantage, not only themselves, but also those that hear them."‡ But what harmony can there be between the soul and the words? or how can her affections keep time with them, when she knows not one syllable of their meaning? If, therefore, we are obliged to sing praises with understanding, we are equally obliged, so far as we are capable, to understand what we sing; and how can we do this while we sing in a language we do not understand!

Again, the Apostle exhorts his Ephesians, in opposition to those drunken songs the heathen used in their Bacchanalia, "To speak to themselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in their hearts to the Lord." Which, in all probability, respects not so much their private conversation, as their public worship, as being opposed to that public drunken worship, which the heathen rendered to their god Bacchus. And if Christians, in their public hymns and songs of praise, are obliged to make melody in their hearts to the Lord, that is, to keep time with what they sing with an

* Reg. Brev. qu. 279. [vol. 2. p. 734. Par. 1839.]

† Theod. in Loc. [vol. 1. p. 906. Hal. 1769.]

‡ Epist. ad Marel. To. 1. p. 279. [vol. 1. p. 756. Heidelb. 1601.]

inward hearty affection, then, doubtless, so far as they are capable, they ought to understand those hymns, which they never can do in a language which they understand not. And to the same purpose the same Apostle exhorts the Church of Colosse,* "to admonish one another in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in their hearts to the Lord." Where, by "singing with melody in our hearts to the Lord," and "singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord," the Fathers generally understand singing with due attention, and answerable affection, to the matter contained in those holy hymns, which they sung in their public assemblies.† But how is it possible for men to attend to, or be duly affected with the matter of words, whereof they do not know the meaning? Either, therefore, the obligation of these Apostolic precepts must be quite worn out, or the Church of Rome must be highly to blame, who, by wording her sacred hymns in an unknown tongue, renders the performance of them impossible to the people.

2dly, The Scripture makes praying in an unknown tongue inconsistent with the edification of the Church; so in sundry passages of 1 Cor. xiv., where the Apostle, throughout the whole chapter, purposely disputes against preaching and praying in an unknown tongue; for in those days the miraculous gift of tongues being very common in the Church of Christ, many of those who were inspired with it, were too apt to overvalue themselves upon it, inasmuch, that to gratify their own vanity and ostentation, it became a usual practice among them (and that particularly in the Church of Corinth) to preach and pray, and sing psalms in languages unknown to their auditory, without ever interpreting what they said into the vulgar tongue, either through wilful neglect, or for want of the gift of interpretation; against which evil practice of theirs, the Apostle purposely opposes himself throughout this whole chapter, and that principally upon this very argument, that it was not consistent with the edification of the Church, which he applies as well to praying as to preaching: so ver. 2, 3, 4,

* Col. iii. 16.

† Ambr. in 5. Eph. 19. [vol. 2. Append. p. 247. Par. 1690.] Chrysost. in loc. [vol. 11. p. 393. Par. 1734.] Jerom. in loc. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 651, 652.] And also the Comment on the same Epistle that goeth under St. Jerome's name. [Ibid. vol. 11. p. 1008.] Theod. in Eph. [vol. 3. p. 432. Hal. 1771.] Primas. Isid. Oecumen. Theophyl. [vol. 2. p. 493. Venet. 1754.] Haimo. Sedul.

5, 6 : "For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God ;" that is, he speaks to the understanding of none but God, who equally understands all languages ; "for no man understandeth him, howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries ; but he that prophesieth," that is, expoundeth Scripture in a known tongue, "speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort ; he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, edifieth himself," provided he understands what he speaks ; "but he that prophesieth, edifies the Church. I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather, that ye prophesied ; for greater is he that prophesieth," that is, he is much more useful to the Church, "than he that speaketh with tongues. Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine," *i.e.* either by expounding sacred figures, or communicating by knowledge in great mysteries, or interpreting difficult Scriptures, or by a catechetical instruction of you, what you ought to believe and do. So again, ver. 18, 19, "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all ; yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue : " in all which places the Apostle doth as expressly condemn preaching in an unknown tongue, without interpreting what is preached, as words can do it. But you will say, what is this to us ? We do no more preach in an unknown tongue than you do : and as for the controversy in hand, it is only about praying in an unknown tongue, of which hitherto the Apostle hath taken no notice. To which I answer, first, that the Roman mass contains in it not only prayers, but sundry portions of Scripture and pious lessons, the latter of which, as well as the former, are read to the people in an unknown tongue. Now either these Scriptures and lessons are read for no end at all, or for the same end with preaching, which is to instruct the people ; and, therefore, the reason which the Apostle urges for preaching in an unknown tongue, *viz.* the edification of the people, doth equally enforce the reading of these Scriptures and lessons in a known tongue. But then, secondly, the Apostle applies this reason of his as well to praying as to preaching in an unknown tongue ; and therefore, if for that reason the one is not to be allowed, neither is the other : the reason why he forbids them to preach

in an unknown tongue is, that it was a hindrance to the edification of the people, and this very reason he urges against their praying in an unknown tongue: so ver. 14, "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit," *i.e.* my gift of tongues, "prays, but my understanding is unfruitful," that is, unfruitful to others. So Theodoret,* "For the fruit of the speaker," saith he, "is the profit of the hearers;" and "when the words of the prayer are unknown to those that are present (saith St. Basil), the mind of him that prays is unfruitful, because it profits none; but when those who are present do understand the prayer so as that it is capable of profiting them, then he who prays hath the fruit, *viz.* the bettering of those that are profited by him."† And that this is the Apostle's meaning, he himself assures us, ver. 17, "for thou verily givest thanks well," *i.e.* thou, it may be, mayest be very devout in thy own heart and affections, whilst thou art praising God in an unknown tongue, "but the other," that is, he that doth not understand the tongues thou speakest, "is not edified." So that the Apostle proceeds upon the same reason against praying as against preaching in an unknown tongue: and this our Catholic Scripturist acknowledges, for so he expounds those forecited words, ver. 14, "(but my understanding is without fruit,) that is," saith he,‡ "without the fruit of instruction, or edifying others;" and therefore, by the way, that passage of his is a little surprising (though it is only what his master Bellarmine had taught him), where he "would have his reader note, that until verse 14, § St. Paul only speaks of using an unknown language in preaching, exhorting, interpreting, and teaching, in all which exercises we still use the vulgar tongue, so that hitherto he hath nothing against us;"|| no not when he himself confesses, that St. Paul urges the very same reason against praying in an unknown tongue, in which they of the Church of Rome agree with those Corinthians against whom he argues, that he had urged before against preaching in an unknown tongue, in which they disagree with them. Whether the reason hold as good against the one as the other, I leave St. Paul and him to dispute it out; but certainly, while a man is urging the same reason against one thing, as he afterwards intends to urge against another, he intentionally levels it at them both, and

* Theod. in loc. [Ibid. p. 258.]

† Basil. Reg. Brev. p. 278. [ut supra, p. 733]

‡ P. 165.

§ De Verb. Dei, lib. 2. c. 16. [vol. 1. p. 67, &c. Prug. 1721.] || P. 163

consequently, seeing St. Paul urges the same reason against praying, which just before he had used against preaching in an unknown tongue, it is a plain case, that while he was urging it against the one, he all along intended it against the other ; and if the unedifyingness of an unknown tongue in either be a good reason against both (as it must be at least in St. Paul's opinion), then while he urges it against an unknown tongue in one, he must necessarily condemn it in both ; so that by our author's good leave, he and his Church are as much concerned in what St. Paul pronounces in the seven first verses of this chapter, where he only mentions preaching in an unknown tongue, as in what he afterwards discourses from ver. 14 to the 18th, where he treats of praying in an unknown tongue, seeing he proceeds upon the same reason in both : and therefore, if notwithstanding this reason, praying in an unknown tongue be allowable, preaching must be so too, seeing the same reason, in St. Paul's opinion, acquits or condemns them both. Is preaching in an unknown tongue allowable ? No, saith our author ; No, saith his master Bellarmine : but why, I beseech you ? Because St. Paul condemns it as being unedifying to the auditors. Is praying in an unknown tongue allowable ? Yes, very allowable, say both. But doth not St. Paul urge the same reason against this as the other ? It is true indeed. Why then, it seems St. Paul's reason is good, where it doth not condemn holy Church's practice ; but where it doth, away with it ; that is, in plain English, it is good or bad, as it serves our turn.

3rdly, The Scripture condemns performing religious offices in an unknown tongue, as directly contrary to the natural end of speech. The natural end of speech is, to communicate our minds to, and make ourselves be understood by one another ; to which there is nothing can be more contrary than speaking in a language that is not understood by those that hear us, because hereby we do no more communicate our minds to them, than if we did not speak at all. And thus St. Paul himself argues, ver. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 : " For even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped ? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle ? So you, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken ? for ye shall speak into the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none

of them without signification; therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh, a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." The design of all which is to shew, that the end of speaking is to be understood; and that therefore he who speaks in a language that is not understood, whether it be in common conversation, or in religious offices, speaks to no purpose. Which reason is equally applicable to speaking in prayer, as in preaching, since if it be not understood, it is as much in vain in the one as in the other. The Romanists would fain justify their using an unknown tongue in their religious offices, upon this pretence, that it is only in praying they do it, not in preaching. But should you ask them, why they speak in a known tongue in preaching? Their answer doubtless would be to this purpose, because we would be understood; which is the proper end of speaking: but then, why do they speak in an unknown tongue when they pray? Sure they will not answer, because they would be understood. But then, to what purpose do they speak at all, seeing, by speaking in an unknown tongue, they lose the proper end of speaking, and consequently speak in vain? And if to speak without end or aim be an absurdity in common conversation, it is doubtless profane as well as absurd in religion: and I should think it much more excusable in the mass priest to hold his tongue, and turn his congregation into a silent meeting, while he is acting over his set form of ceremonies, than to speak out the public prayers to them in a language which they do not understand, it being far more seemly, in a religious exercise, not to speak at all, than to speak to no purpose: and St. Paul, I am sure, is fully of this opinion, for it was upon this reason that he required those who had the gift of tongues, "if there were no interpreter, to keep silence in the Church, and to speak to himself and to God," ver 28. For either words are of some use in public prayer, or they are not; if they are not, doubtless it would be far more becoming that sacred office to lay them wholly aside; if they are, it must be either upon God's account, or men's: not upon God's to be sure, who understands our thoughts and desires, as well without words as with them. If upon men's account, it must be either wholly upon the priests' that pronounce them, or upon the people's also; if it be wholly upon the priest's account, it must be to raise his devotion, and then he himself must understand the meaning of them (which their lack-Latin priests cannot pretend to), for how can the devotion

of his mind be raised by words that signify nothing to his mind? Or if he doth understand them, why may he not as well raise his devotion with them, by reading them to himself alone, as by reading them out to the people, seeing by reading them to himself, he follows the Apostolic precept of suppressing his unknown tongue, and of "speaking only to himself and to God?" But if words are necessary in public prayers upon the people's account also, then it must be either to direct them what to pray for, or to unite their desires in the same petitions; neither of which can be performed by such words as they do not understand: so that I cannot apprehend of what use the reading or speaking the Latin prayers can be in a mere English auditory, (suppose) it is no more than breathing of so many empty sounds (that signify nothing) into the empty air, whilst the priests and people are mere barbarians to one another, that like two senseless echoes, speak and respond they know not what, and to no purpose.

4thly, The Scripture expressly declares praying in an unknown tongue to be contrary to the design and nature of religious worship; which being* "a reasonable service," requires that our rational faculties should closely attend to, and concur with it; for the life of divine worship consists in the internal acts of the mind, such as desire, and love, and hope, and fear, and reverence, &c. And unless these concur with the external significations of our worship (that is, our words and actions), and inform and animate them, it is all but a dead formality. But how is it possible for us to join these inward affections of our minds, with those outward significations of our worship, when we know not what they signify? How should I accompany my kneeling or prostration in prayer, with my inward awe and veneration, while I am perfectly ignorant of the meaning and signification of those gestures? And when I lift up my hands and eyes to heaven, how can I exert with it an inward aspiration of my soul to God, if I do not know that by the one I signify the other? In short, how is it possible for my mind, in any instance, either in fact or fiction, to join the thing signified with the sign, when I know not what the sign signifies? And as it is in actions in prayer, so it is in words, to which it is impossible for us to join those desires and hopes which they express and signify, if we do not know their signification. Whilst therefore men say their prayers in an unknown tongue, it is impossible for them to

* Rom. xii. 1.

join their affections with them ; and whilst their affections are separate from them, they are so far from being acceptable prayers, that they are only so many empty sounds in the ears of God. And upon this very topic the Apostle himself disputes against praying in an unknown tongue, in the 15th and 16th verses of the aforecited chapter : “ What is it then ? I will pray with the spirit (or gift of tongues), and I will pray with the understanding also ;” *i. e.* as he who hath not the gift of tongues is wont to pray, *viz.* in a language that he, and those who pray with him, understand. “ I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit (or thy unknown tongue), how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned (or hath not thy gift), say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest ?” Where the Apostle makes it necessary, in all public prayer, that he who is the mouth of the congregation, should pray, or at least interpret his prayer in the vulgar language of the people ; and that for this reason, because, unless the people understand the language of his prayer, they are not capable of praying with him ; and if they cannot pray in a language they do not understand, then an unknown tongue is utterly inconsistent with the nature of prayer. And hence, in the following verse (where he still pursues this reason), he supposes it necessary for those who are to join in the public service, “ to be edified,” *i. e.* (as it is notoriously evident, from the whole context) to understand the sense and meaning of the words. This is the Apostle’s own argument, and when once our adversaries have made it appear, that men may truly pray in a language unknown to them, for my part, I shall readily yield, that they have fairly baffled us and St. Paul together : but in the mean time this argument stands in force against them, in despite of all their cavils and evasions, which shall be considered in their proper place.

5thly, The Scripture makes praying in an unknown tongue utterly inconsistent with that joint concurrence of devotion that is required in public worship. That in all our public assemblies for divine worship, it is required that we should join our hearts and affections in the same confessions, petitions, and thanksgivings, is evident, as from sundry other arguments, so particularly from that response, Amen, which the people of God did always make at the close of their public prayers ; by which they expressed the consent of their hearts and affections with those petitions and thanksgivings that were

offered up in their public assemblies. So in their public imprecations upon themselves and others, the Jews were expressly commanded to respond Amen;* and in the close of the psalm of praise which David offered to be sung by the choir in the temple, we are told, that "all the people said Amen, and praised the Lord;"† and so also when Ezra, in a public assembly of the Jews, blessed the Lord the great God, it is said, that "all the people answered Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands."‡ And this practice of theirs the Psalmist himself expressly orders and directs, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting, and let all the people say Amen."§ And accordingly we find this very practice continued in the Primitive Church; for so Justin Martyr|| tells us, that the people always concluded the Divine service with a solemn εὐφημία Ἀμὴν. By all which it is evident, that the people of God always esteemed themselves obliged to concur in their hearts and affections, and to make some expression of their concurrence with the public prayers, which, how is it possible for them to perform when those prayers are read to them in a language which they do not understand? How can their hearts follow, where their understandings cannot lead? And in short, how can they hope, desire, or give thanks for they know not what? Nay, and when they know not whether the words which they hear, contain a petition or a thanksgiving? And this is St. Paul's own argument, ver. 15, 16: "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." I do allow that you may lawfully use your gift of tongues in your public worship; but then you must be sure that you interpret your tongue, that so you may be intelligible to others, "else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"¶ Where it is first implied, that the common people ought to say Amen; that is, to consent with their hearts and affections in the public prayers, and to express their consent in them. And, secondly, it is expressly asserted, that this they are not capable of performing, if they do not understand the language

* Deut. xxvii. 15.

† Nehem. viii. 6.

‡ Apol. 2.

† 1 Chron. xvi. 36.

§ Psal. cvi. [48.]

¶ 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

of their prayers ; and if the unlearned Corinthians could not say Amen to those inspired prayers, for this reason, because they knew not what he who dictated and pronounced them, said ; for the same reason, neither can the common people in the Roman Church say Amen to their Latin prayers, because they know as little what is said, when they are read to them. So that by expressing her public prayers in a language unknown to the people, the Church of Rome renders their duty of saying Amen to them impracticable.

6thly, The Scripture represents prayers in an unknown tongue as a great indecency in public worship : for what an extravagant spectacle would it seem to a stranger that knows nothing of the matter, to see a company of people assemble together, with a mighty appearance of devotion, only to see or hear a priest officiating to them in a form of words, of which neither they or he himself perhaps understands one syllable. Suppose that this stranger should go from one to another round the congregation, and ask them every one in their ear, " Good sir, you seem to be mightily concerned and affected with what yonder man in the gay garment is reading ; for my part, I understand not one word that he says, I would fain know whether you do ? " And suppose they should all of them answer, " No truly, friend, we understand no more than you. " " But why then do you ejaculate your eyes, lift up your hands, and beat your breasts as if you did understand them ? " " Why as for that, we can give no other reason, but that we believe they are very devout words, and it is an old fashion among us thus to behave ourselves whilst they are reading. " What would this stranger think of these people ? Would he not laugh at their simplicity, and be apt to suspect some flaw in their brain-pans ? And yet just thus doth St. Paul represent the case, ver. 23 : " If therefore the whole Church be come together in one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad ? " But why will they say so ? Because those that come to your meeting, knowing that you meet upon a religious account, come with an intent to understand your way of worship, to hear what you pray for, and to learn what you teach ; instead of which, you only fill their ears with a loud rattle of unintelligible sounds, which convey no other notion to their minds, but only this, that you are out of your wits, seeing, like so many madmen, you speak and hear without any end or aim : for to what purpose can you speak, when

you do not speak to be understood? Or to what purpose can you hear, when you do not hear to understand? And if speaking in an unknown tongue was so great an indecency in those Corinthian assemblies, as that in St. Paul's opinion it represented them more like congregations of madmen than of worshippers; I doubt, if St. Paul had the censuring of the Latin worship in the Roman Churches, where, in most places, scarce one in five hundred understands it, it would hardly pass for a very reasonable service.

7thly, The Scripture declares an unknown tongue in divine service to be of no other use, but only to give evidence to the truth of the Christian religion, which use it serves not as it is acquired by natural means, but as it is miraculously infused; for the gift of tongues was one of those miracles by which God gave testimony to the truth of the Gospel, which it testified no otherwise than as all other miracles did, *viz.* as it was a sensible effect of the Divine power, and this is all the use that the Apostle allows it in the public exercise of religious worship, ver. 21, 22: "In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people, and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord;" *i. e.* though I intend to speak unto them in a miraculous manner, *viz.* by inspiring those by whom I intend to speak with the miraculous gift of speaking unknown languages, yet still they will continue obstinate in their unbelief; from whence he infers in the next verse, "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not; but prophecy serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe;" *i. e.* the great end of speaking unknown languages in your religious assemblies is, that by this miraculous gift you may convince unbelievers of the truth of the religion you teach: but the gift of prophesying, or explaining to the people the holy Scripture in their vulgar language, serves for the edification of believers, and not for the conviction of infidels. Seeing therefore that the proper use of speaking in an unknown language in religious assemblies, was to give a miraculous attestation to the truth of Christianity; it thence necessarily follows, that when speaking an unknown language in our religious assemblies doth not serve this use, it serves no religious use at all; but the Latin tongue, as it is used in the religious assemblies of the Roman Church, can be no miraculous attestation of the Christian religion (unless you will suppose it a miracle for a Mass priest to understand it), and therefore it can

be of no religious use there. If therefore an unknown tongue, even when it was miraculous, and as such, did serve the common end of miracles, was not to be used in public worship, without an interpreter; how much less should an unknown tongue be used, that is acquired by mere natural means; and if the use of it were allowable upon this account only, because it was a miracle; then when it is no miracle, it is no longer allowable at all; suppose Latin to have been one of those unknown tongues that was spoke in those Corinthian assemblies, if St. Paul condemned the use of it without an interpreter in that Church, even though it was miraculous, and as such, was a sign to convince unbelievers, how much more would he have condemned it now in the Roman Church, where it is only an acquired endowment, and as such, can be no sign at all, unless it be of the folly and wickedness of those that impose it?

IV. I now proceed to the fourth and last head of discourse proposed, which is to consider and examine the objections which the Romanists urge against these arguments of ours, which are all of them reducible to one general head; which is this, that in 1 Cor. xiv. whence we deduce the main of our arguments, the Apostle there treats not of the stated liturgy or worship of their public assemblies, but of certain extemporary exercises of preaching and prayer performed by them, by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, in the latter of which they allow, that St. Paul disapproves the use of an unknown tongue, at least without an interpreter, but not in the former: so Bellarmine,* Vane,† and our Catholic Scripturist.‡ To which I answer,

1st, That it doth not appear, either from this chapter, or any other part of this Epistle, that they had any other liturgy of prayers in their public assemblies (excepting the Lord's Prayer), than what was performed extemporaneously by inspired persons; and indeed whilst immediate inspirations were so frequent and ordinary among the pastors of the Church, and particularly of this Church of Corinth, there seems not to have been that urgent occasion for stated forms of liturgy, as there was afterwards, when immediate inspiration ceased, or became less common; for as by this gift of immediate inspiration, the pastors were secured from all errors and indecencies in these their extemporary effusions; so the people having a moral assurance that the prayers, which were offered up in their

* De Verb. Dei, lib. 2. c. 16. [ut supra.] † Lost Sheep, p. 355. ‡ P. 164.

public assemblies, were immediately dictated by the Spirit of God, could safely concur with them in their hearts and affections, without making any pause to examine either the truth or lawfulness, fitness or propriety of each particular passage; to which great inconveniences both pastors and people are unavoidably exposed, whilst they join in such extempore prayers as are immediately dictated from the invention of the speaker; to prevent which, when the gift of immediate inspiration ceased, or at least became more rare, it is highly probable that the bishops and pastors of the several Churches collected from the prayers of these inspired persons, such confessions, petitions, and thanksgivings, as they thought most proper, and composed them into set forms of public prayer; so that stated liturgies seem to have been substituted in the room of inspired prayers, and designed to supply the discontinuance of immediate inspiration; for it is very strange, that if from the first beginning of Christianity there had been stated liturgies prepared either by Christ or his Apostles for all Christian Churches, there should no mention be made of them, either in Scripture or primitive antiquity; for, as for those liturgies that go under the venerable names of the Apostles, such as St. James's, St. Peter's, and St. Mark's, it is now agreed by almost all the learned of all sides, that though some parts of them are very ancient, and seem to have been introduced into the Christian assemblies long before the close of the first century, yet none of them are of that prime antiquity they pretend to; but for men so confidently to affirm, that besides these inspired extemporary prayers, there was at the same time a stated liturgy used in the public assemblies of the Church of Corinth, when they have not the least shadow of true authority for it, is a suspicious sign that their faces have at length outworn the mean infirmity of blushing. But if it be true that stated liturgies were introduced to supply the room of inspired prayers, then there is the same reason why the former should be expressed in a known tongue, as the latter; because where one thing is placed in the stead of another, they must be both designed for the same end; and therefore seeing, that to obtain the end of an inspired prayer, it was necessary it should be expressed in a known tongue, it is no less necessary to obtain the end of a set form of prayer, the end of both being the same.

2ndly, I answer, that all those reasons which the Apostle assigns against the use of an unknown tongue in an inspired

prayer, make as effectually against the use of it in a stated liturgy, or form of prayer. This I doubt not will evidently appear upon a just examination of those pretended disparities, which our adversaries make between the one and the other, which yet are only in three of those seven particular reasons assigned by the Apostle : so that though we should allow these three to be real, yet till they find out four disparities more, there are four substantial arguments of the Apostle will still remain in force against them ; and I am apt to think, that unless the four to be yet found out, prove better than the three that are found, it will appear in the main issue, that they have taken a great deal of pains to seek for that which they had much better have lost than found.

The first disparity they pretend, between using an unknown tongue in an inspired prayer, and a stated liturgy is, that those inspired prayers were intended for the edification of the people ; but so are not stated liturgies, and therefore there is not the same necessity why the latter should be in a known tongue as the former. Thus Fisher,* Dr. Vane,† the Catholic Scripturist,‡ and Bellarmine himself.§ To which I answer :

First, That stated liturgies ought to be designed for the edification of the people, as well as those inspired prayers were : and therefore when the Romanists tell us, that they are not so designed, we give them free leave to speak this for themselves, and for their own liturgy ; and the greater shame we think it is, both for them and that ; but we can by no means allow them to say this for us, or for any other Christians in the world, there being none but themselves that we could ever hear of, that have the face to affirm, that their public liturgies were never designed for the edification of the people, which perhaps is one of the worst things that can be said of a liturgy ; for the great end of public liturgies (as I shall shew by and by), is to direct the devotions of Christian assemblies into a common concurrence, with such confessions, petitions, and thanksgivings, as are most conducive to their spiritual benefit and advantage, to prescribe to them such confessions of sin as are most apt to inspire them with sorrow for, and hatred and abhorrence of it, such petitions for mercy as are most apt to affect them with the sense of their wants, and of their dependence upon God for supply and relief, with such praises and thanksgivings as are most apt to excite in them a grateful sense

* Apud Dr. White, p. 374, 375. † P. 358. ‡ P. 166. § Ibid.

of the Divine goodness, a flagrant love of God, and a profound admiration of his perfections, together with an active resolution of transcribing and imitating them in their conversation. In a word, the end which God aims at in requiring us to pray to him, is not merely that we may pray to him, and accost him with our bended knees and humble supplications, but principally, that by praying to him, we may improve ourselves in all those holy and devout dispositions, wherein the perfection of our nature doth consist; and this the Trent Catechism itself acknowledges, *viz.* “That the especial end of our praying to God is, that by conversing with him, we may be the more ardently excited to the love and adoration of him.”* And this, as all agree, is the greatest and most valuable part of our edification. And if the Church of Rome intends, that the public prayers should minister to this end, *viz.* the people’s edification, doubtless she ought to let the people understand them; for how they can be edified by hearing such prayers as they do not understand, I am not yet able to comprehend; but if she doth not intend it, I doubt that God’s intention and hers will be found directly opposite to one another. I am sure St.† Paul requires, that in our religious assemblies, “all things should be done unto edifying.” Not so, saith the Scripturist, for the greatest part of what is done there, *viz.* the stated and ordinary service of the Church, is not to be done to edifying. So then it seems, the meaning of, “let all things be done,” is no more than this, let some few things, and those the most inconsiderable, “be done to edifying.” Bellarmine indeed speaks something more warily, telling us that‡ “the instruction and consolation of the people is not the principal end of divine offices.” But then it seems it is an end, and therefore though it be not the principal one, it ought to be aimed at. But how can they at all aim to instruct the people’s understandings by such divine offices as they do not understand? or, how can they intend the people’s consolation by such forms of words as convey no sense or meaning to their minds? Well, but what then is the principal end of these divine offices? Why, “the worship of God,” saith§ Bellarmine. But to what purpose serves their worship of God? Do they worship him purely, to worship him without any further end and prospect? If so, I am sure they fall short of God’s end in requiring worship from

* Part. 4. c. 2. sect. 7, 8. [p. 396, 397. Lips. 1843.] + 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

‡ De Verb. Dei. lib. 2. c. 189. [c. 16.] [ut supra, p. 70. col. 1] § Ibid.

his creatures ; for it is not for any advantage to himself, that he requires our worship and service : “ Our goodness extends not to him,” saith the Psalmist ;* “ nor is it any gain to him that we make our ways perfect :”† and therefore if he aim at any good or advantage at all in it, it must be at ours ; that by these our solemn addresses to him, we may be inspired with such an awful sense of his majesty, as is necessary to oblige us to our duty, that thereby we may be accomplished with all those heavenly graces and perfections, that are necessary to our own happiness ; and if for this end (which is in other words our own edification) God requires our worship, for this end we ought to render it to him. It is true, saith the Scripturist, this was the end of those inspired prayers St. Paul makes mention of, *viz.*‡ “ To edify the brethren assembled, to excite them to love, to honour, and to praise God, not intending chiefly to pray to God for the people, as we do in our liturgy.” But do they design at all “ to edify the brethren,” &c. in their liturgy ? If not, I am sure their liturgy falls short of one of the common ends of divine worship ; if they do, all that he talks is dull impertinence, seeing an unknown tongue doth equally obstruct the edification of the brethren in a composed liturgy, as in an inspired prayer.

2dly, That there are sundry parts of the Roman liturgy, which can serve no end at all, unless it be the people’s edification ; such are the lessons, the creeds, and pious exhortations, which make a considerable part of it ; the reading of which in their public assemblies, can be of no other use, but only to instruct and edify the people. The prayers, as they pretend, are the prayers of the priest only, whose peculiar office it is to offer them up for the people, and therefore there is no need that the people should understand them. But surely they will not say that their creeds and Scripture lessons are the priest’s only, or that it is his peculiar office to be instructed by the word of God, and make confession of the Christian faith, or that he is to understand for the people, and confess the faith for the people, as well as pray for them ; for if so, I doubt the priest at last must go to heaven or hell too for the people ; seeing he, it seems, must either perform or neglect for them a principal part of their religion : unless therefore they will allow that the Scriptures and creeds in their public service are intended for the edification of the people, I cannot

* Psal. xvi. 2.

† Job. xxii. [3.]

‡ P. 164.

imagine to what end they serve there, unless it be like the dead pictures in arras, to entertain the eye, and make an empty show of doing something, while they do nothing. But if they are inserted there for the edification of the people, why are they inserted in an unknown tongue? Is it possible that the people should be edified by that which they do not understand? or that their minds should be at all informed by that which conveys no meaning to their minds? The Apostle tells us, that* “all Scriptures are profitable for instruction.” And that† “whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning;” he means, for the learning of the people sure as well as the priest. But how can the Scriptures in the Roman service be profitable for the instruction and learning of the people, when they are all shut up from them in the dark lantern of an unknown tongue, and not permitted to transmit to them the least ray of light and information? It is certain therefore, whatever end these Scripture lessons are designed for, they cannot be designed to serve the end of Scripture, because the end of Scripture is to instruct, which it can never do in an unknown tongue.

We are told by the Council of Trent, that “the mass contains very plentiful matter of instruction for all faithful people:”‡ and truly, if it doth not, in my opinion, it is a very *jejune* and fruitless office of public worship; but “notwithstanding it doth so (say those goodly Fathers), it doth by no means seem expedient to us, that it should every where be celebrated in the vulgar tongue;”§ or indeed, that it should be any where so celebrated; for immediately afterwards they decree, “that the custom of every Church in this matter should be every where retained,” *i. e.* that the mass should be every where celebrated in Latin, that being then the custom of every Church in communion with the Church of Rome; which is in effect to make this open declaration to the people, “Good people, you must know, that in this same mass-book of ours, there is contained such excellent matter for edification, as if you could come at it, would do you a world of good, and make you much wiser and better Christians than you are: but for reasons best known to ourselves, we think it expedient to lock it up from you in an unknown tongue: and therefore, pray

* 2 Tim. iii. [16.]

† Rom. xv. 4.

‡ Sess. 22. c. 3. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 854. Lut. Par. 1672.]

§ Ibid.

satisfy your hunger with the belief, that here is great store of spiritual food for you, though you never be permitted to taste of it ; and if you can subsist by believing, or make shift to live upon the picture of a feast ; or which is the same thing, to feed and nourish your hungry souls with the sound of words, without the sense of them, with all our hearts, much good may it do you." Good God ! what shameful bantering is this, in a matter of infinite moment ! Are not the people most extremely obliged to these tender-hearted Fathers, that only talk to them of bread, but give them a stone ? But here all on a sudden, a pang of fatherly compassion seizes them : but "lest (say they immediately after) the sheep of Christ should hunger, and the little ones desire bread, and there be none to break it to them, the holy synod commands pastors, and all that have the care of souls, by themselves, or others, while the mass is celebrated, frequently to expound some part of those things which are read in it." This indeed is something, but in reality amounts to very little. For,

First, They knew very well, that abundance of their priests at that very time, understood the language of their mass no more than the people, and so were incapable of expounding it to them.

Secondly, That they could not but foresee, that several of their priests, who were able, would yet, through negligence, very often omit the expounding it, as it is notorious they have done ever since, and do to this day ; in which cases, let their mass contain never so much matter of edification, it is impossible it should edify their people, or render them either the better or wiser ; and so notwithstanding this their pretended charitable provision, they have so ordered the matter, that abundance of their "little ones who desire bread," are in danger of famishing for want of it, they having locked it up from them in an unknown tongue, and left them to the courtesy of such economists, as do sometimes want will, and sometimes ability, to distribute it to them ; whereas had they but taken care to have it set before them in their own native languages, those of them who were truly hungry, would have made a shift, whenever they wanted help, to help themselves ; but this will by no means down with that Church's politics, which stints the people to the priest's allowance, and to reduce them to a perfect dependence, proportions them no more spiritual food, than just what he thinks fit to carve them. But then,

Thirdly, It is only some part of the mass that they oblige

the priest to expound to the people; they do not prescribe how much, but leave that wholly to the priest's discretion, who may expound as little as he pleases; if they expound but one in an hundred of those sentences, wherein this matter of edification is contained, the injunction is satisfied, though there are ninety-nine of the hundred for which they are never the wiser; so that the far greatest part of this their plentiful matter of edification doth, notwithstanding this injunction, remain incapable of edifying for want of being expounded; for the reason why they expound any part of it, is, because it cannot edify the people while it is read to them in an unknown tongue; which reason, if it be good, obliges them either to expound the whole every time they read it, or to read no more than they expound; for if it cannot edify the people without being expounded, either the priests must be very uncharitable in not expounding to them all they read, or very impertinent in reading to them more than they expound.

Fourthly, The injunction is only, that they frequently expound; but how often is not determined, whether once a week, or once a month, or once a quarter; all this is left to the discretion of the priest, who, if he be either negligent or unskilful, can make this *frequently* to signify as seldom as he pleases; and I believe none of them ever thought themselves obliged by it to expound these edifying things, as often as they read them: but then to what purpose do they read them, when they do not expound them? For how can they be edified by that which they do not understand? The Council itself supposes, that when the priest doth not expound, "the sheep of Christ must hunger, and the little ones desire bread in vain, there being none to break it to them;" for if it is to prevent this mischief (as they pretend at least) that they impose this frequent exposition; so that by this *frequently*, they license their priests many times to send Christ's sheep away an hungry, and not to break the bread of life to them, let them never so earnestly desire it; and seeing how often is not determined, it is as often as the priest thinks fit; so that, after all, this seemingly compassionate injunction amounts to no more than this: It is our will and pleasure, good people, to lock up the bread of life from you in an unknown tongue; but lest you should starve, we do hereby enjoin your priests frequently, or as often as they please, to bring it forth and break it to you in your own native language. Truly, we are much obliged to your good Fatherhoods for enjoining our priests to use us as they

please, or, which is much the same, to feed us as often as they shall reckon themselves obliged by this loose and undetermined *frequently*; but God help our poor souls that are thus abandoned by you (who should have taken better care of them) to the mere mercy and charity of every slothful, or vicious, or ignorant priest.

Fifthly, and lastly, The exposition here enjoined, is not at all specified or determined; they tell us, that those prayers and religious discourses, which St. Paul treats of, were designed for the edification of the people, and therefore it was necessary they should be interpreted into their vulgar language. Was it so? Then pray what was the plentiful matter of edification in your mass designed for? To be sure, if for any thing, it was for the edification of the people; and if so, the same reason obliges you to interpret it into the language of the people; and therefore, if by expounding it, they do not mean interpreting it into the vulgar language, by their own confession St. Paul's reason is as much against their matter of edification in Latin, as against those sermons and prayers in an unknown tongue; so that, unless, by their exposition of this matter, they mean interpreting it into the vulgar language, St. Paul's reason, even by their own confession, doth as much conclude their priests to be men that speak into the air, and barbarians to their people, and doth as much oblige them to keep silence in the Church, as it did those inspired speakers in an unknown tongue, against whom he levels it; but that by expounding, they do not mean this sort of interpretation, we have too much reason to believe; not only because no such interpretation is practised among them, or at least very rarely, but also because their own divines tell us, that the sense of the Council was, "that the people should be instructed only by sermons,"* and that such a verbal interpretation, during the celebration of the mass, was condemned by the Council, "as the cause and seed-plot of many errors:"† by which it seems, that by expounding, they meant no more than preaching upon, or expounding some doctrine or ceremony contained in the mass; and if so, it is no more an expounding of the mass, than of any other book in which that doctrine is contained: so that hitherto I cannot apprehend to what purpose all this plentiful matter of edification in the mass-book serves; not to edify the

* Vid. Ledesm. c. 15. Sect. Decret. Con. Trid. n. 2.

† Vid. Epist. Cler. An. 1660. p. 62.

people to be sure ; for why then should it be locked ^{up} from their understanding ? Ay, but it is there that it may be read to them : but to what purpose is it to read to them, when such effectual care is taken that they should never be the wiser for it ? Why, it is read, that it may be expounded ; but sure it may be expounded whether it be read or no ; and then to what purpose is it read, when it is not expounded ? Why are the people's ears continually harassed with a tedious jangling of words, which signify nothing to their minds ? They contain in them edifying matter, you will say : but what does this edifying matter signify, when it is so worded that it cannot edify ? In short, therefore, all this plentiful matter of edification, which the Council assures us their mass contains, is only a cypher to the people ; while it is continued in an unknown tongue, it is read to them with as little effect, as if it were read only to their church walls ; it being impossible that they should be edified by hearing that which they do not understand, nor doth the exposition they require at all mend the matter, seeing by that they do not mean rendering it into the vulgar language, without which their reading it is all in vain ; and if they did, yet still their reading it in Latin is impertinent : for to what purpose can their reading of edifying matter serve, whilst they read it so that it cannot edify, unless it be to shew that the priest hath learning enough to read Latin. So that this pretended disparity between the stated liturgy of the Church, and those inspired prayers and discourses of which St. Paul treats, *viz.* that the one was designed for edification, and the other not, amounts to nothing ; both because public liturgies ought to be designed for edification, and a great part of the Roman liturgy must be so designed, as well as those inspired prayers and sermons, and consequently the one as well as the other ought to be expressed in the known and vulgar language, without which neither can edify.

2ndly, Another disparity they make between stated liturgies, and those religious exercises St. Paul treats of, is, that in the latter the people were obliged to join, but not in the former ; thus our Scripturist : * “ These prayers, *i. e.* the set forms of prayer in our liturgy, are chiefly appointed to the priest, who well understands them, to offer them up to God for the people ;” and elsewhere, † “ The chief end of the liturgy is

* Pag. 166.

† Pag. 168.

to pray to God for the people." So also Bellarmine: "The prayer of the Church is not made to the people, but to God for the people, and therefore there is no need that the people should understand it, in order to their profiting by it; but it is sufficient that God understands;" which he illustrates by one man's presenting a Latin petition to the king, for another who understands not Latin:* which plainly implies, that in the Church's prayer the priest only prays for the people, but not the people for themselves. And thus also Fisher more expressly:† "The public service is for a continual daily tribute or homage of prayer and thanksgiving to be offered publicly, and paid unto God by his priests." And from hence they conclude, that though it was very necessary that those inspired prayers should be spoken in the vulgar tongue, because all the people were obliged to join in them; yet as for stated liturgies, provided the priests understand them, whose prayers they properly are, it is no great matter whether the people understand them or no, they being not obliged to pray them: it is needful indeed, that the people know what is done in general, *viz.* "That God is worshipped and honoured, that the priest prays to him; that good things are asked of him for the people, and thanks given to him; that the memory of Christ and his passion are celebrated, and the sacrifice offered to God: and this no clown is ignorant of, and this is sufficient."‡ To which I answer:

First, That though the people were not obliged to join in the stated offices of public prayer, yet there is the same reason why they should understand the language of them, as why they should understand any thing at all appertaining to them; they themselves confess, that in their public liturgy there are sundry things, at least, which the people ought to understand, either by actions, ceremonies, and circumstances, or by custom, affinity with the vulgar, or books interpreting and containing prayers correspondent to every part wherein the auditory is concerned;§ and that by public signals they should be taught when to kneel, to adore, to knock their breasts, when to rise, when to stand, or to do any thing else that concerns them, or is proper for them to do.|| "It is enough," say the Rhemists, "that the people can tell this holy oraison (*viz.* Pater Noster), to be appointed to call upon God, though they do not know to

* De. Verb. Dei, lib. 2. c. 16. [vol. 1. p. 68. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

† See Dr. White, p. 374, 375.

‡ Ledesma, c. c. 21. n. 23.

§ Protest. Destit. of Script. Proof, p. 9.

|| Cath. Script. p. 166.

what petition their part pertaineth;" and sure if this be enough, then so much is needful: but why is it necessary to know these things, *viz.* That Pater Noster is a form of words appointed to call upon God, unless it be to excite them by the sound of these words to call upon God, or that such and such actions, ceremonies, and circumstances are intended for signals to them, when to kneel, to adore, to knock their breasts, &c. unless it be to stir up their hearts to that inward devotion and compunction, which these actions of theirs do express and signify; and if this be the reason, then certainly it is at least as necessary that they should call upon God when Pater Noster is pronounced, and be inwardly devout and contrite when the signals are given to kneel, &c., as to know those things which are but the means of these ends. There can be no religious purpose served by the people's knowing, that now the priest is calling upon God, unless it be to excite them to call upon God also; and if it be necessary for them to know that God is invoked, to the end that they may invoke him; then sure it is as necessary for them to invoke him, as to know that he is invoked; and if it be necessary that the people should be instructed, when the priest is praying, to the end that they may pray also; sure it is necessary they should be instructed in such manner as is most effectual to excite them to pray; and then I would fain know, whether plain and intelligible words are not far more instructive than dumb shows and signs? Or, whether an illiterate Englishman would not be far better instructed, in order to his being excited to pray, by Our Father, which he understands, than by Pater Noster, which he understands not; or, which is the same thing, whether men's devout affections are better excited with their understanding or without it? For I would fain know; are the people obliged to call upon God when they hear those words Pater Noster, or to confess their sins with contrition of soul, when they hear Miserere? If they are not, what necessity is there, that they should know that Pater Noster is an invocation of God, or Miserere a confession of sin to him? Seeing in point of duty they are not at all concerned in it; if they are, I desire to know again, whether they are obliged to call upon God, and confess their sins in that form of words, or in some other: if in that form, then, in the first place, the people are obliged to join with the priest in the public prayer, which is the point we contend for: and, secondly, they ought to understand the sense and meaning of those forms, it being

impossible for them to express the devotion of their minds in a form of words which they do not understand: if in some other, the Church ought to have provided such other forms, as the people might understand (which it yet never did); otherwise whilst the priest, who had less need of a form, is praying and confessing by form; the people who have more need, must be left to pray and confess *extempore*; and for what good reason this should be, I cannot apprehend, seeing not only the matter of the Roman prayers, but the words too (if they were translated into the people's language), are generally as proper for the people to pray and confess in, as for the priest: either therefore the people are bound to pray in time of public prayer, or they are not; if they are not, I see no necessity why they should be instructed in anything appertaining to the public prayers, seeing their duty is not at all concerned in them; if they are, what good reason can there be assigned why they should not pray in those forms of prayer which the priest reads to them? seeing the matter of those prayers is as proper for the people to pray, as for the priest, and consequently so would the prayers themselves, if they were but expressed in the people's language.

Secondly, That there is no part of public worship, in which the duty of the people is not as well concerned as of the priest. The public worship of Christians consists either of prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, or of communion in the Christian sacraments. To all which, I think no Christian will deny, but the people are as much obliged as the priest; and therefore to quote Scripture proofs for this, would be the same thing as to cite chapter and verse to evince that all Christians are obliged to believe in God and in Jesus Christ: and if in all these instances, all Christians, as well laity as clergy, are obliged to worship God, then either they are obliged to it in private only, or in public also: if in private only, to what purpose should they frequent the public worship whercin they have nothing to do? For what can they have to do in public worship, but to worship? If in public also, then either they must join with the priest in their acts of worship, and pray, and praise, and give thanks with him in the same stated forms, which is the thing we contend for (and which draws after it an absolute necessity of having those stated forms in the vulgar language, it being impossible for them to pray and give thanks for they know not what); or else they must perform their worship separately from the priest, either in distinct forms of

prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving, or from their own extemporary invention, which (besides what hath been said against it under the former head) must necessarily introduce a vast confusion into the public worship; for at this rate it will be impossible for them ever to unite their hearts and affections in the same things, which is the peculiar advantage of public worship; that there is a concurrence of hearts in the same acts of worship, and an union of desires in the same petitions throughout the whole congregation, which renders them more acceptable and prevalent: but whilst the people are left to pray separately from the public liturgy, in all probability there will be as many different hopes, desires, and affections in their worship, as there are different men in the congregation; here will be one confessing his sins, there another returning thanks for mercy; and whilst this man is praying for heaven, another will be praying for a good harvest, a third for repentance or pardon, a fourth for a sick wife or child; and whilst a fifth is imploring of assistance against temptations, a sixth will be deprecating thunder and lightning, storms and tempest; and so there will be as vast a confusion of affections in their worship, as there was of languages among the bricklayers of Babel. If therefore the people are at all obliged to pray, and praise, and give thanks in the public worship, which, one would think, no Christian should deny; it is impossible for them otherwise to perform it with any decency or order, but in conjunction with the priest in the public prayers, or liturgy; and this they can never do, unless they understand the language of it. And then as for the sacraments, seeing the people as well as the priest do, by partaking of them, enter into and renew their vow and covenant with God, which, so far forth as they are capable, must be their own free and voluntary act, it is necessary they should join and concur in them, either by their sponsors, who act for them, as in baptism, or by themselves, acting for themselves, as in the eucharist; for how can they perform a federal right between God and themselves, without concurring in it by their own free act and deed? We are told indeed by the Representer, "that the mass being a sacrifice wherein is daily commemorated the death and passion of Christ, by an oblation made by the priest of the body and blood of the immaculate Lamb, under the symbols of bread and wine, according to his own institution; it is not the business of the congregation present, to employ their ears in attending to the words, but their hearts in contemplation of the Divine mysteries, by raising up fervent

affection of love, thanksgiving, &c. And for this," he tells us, "there is little need of words, a true faith without these is all-sufficient." Now granting all this to be true, about the mass being a sacrifice in the Roman sense; yet, by this author's good leave, I cannot apprehend, but that if the words they use in the celebration of it, were plain and intelligible to the people, and apt and proper for the occasion, their employing their ears in attending to them, would very much assist their hearts in contemplation of the Divine mysteries, &c. Nor can I think their faith so all-sufficient, especially in a point so contradictory to their reason (as transubstantiation is), as not to need the assistance of plain, instructive, and persuasive words. The Apostle tells us, "that faith itself comes by hearing;" and that which begets it, to be sure must nourish and increase it. But if words are of no use at all in the celebration of the mass, in the name of God, to what end do they use them? And why are people "commanded (as just before he tells us they are) to assist at the Church service, and to hear mass," when "in this they are instructed not to understand the words, but to know what is done?" What confounded gibberish is this! The people must hear the words of the mass, "but not employ their ears in attending to the words;" that is, they must hear them so as not to hear them. Again, they must hear the words of the mass, "and be therein instructed not to understand the words;" that is, they must hear the words to no purpose, so as to be never the better or wiser for hearing them. Once more, they must hear the words of the mass, which they do not understand, so as to understand by them what is done in the mass; that is, they must understand by words which they do not understand. Well, go thy way for a bold heroic self-contradictor, thou mayest defy the best master of nonsense of them all, to vouch in so few lines, so many direct repugnancies. But to pass by all this; is there nothing in their mass but only the sacrifice? Are there not lections and sequences proper enough to edify the people, were they permitted to understand them? Are there not responses appointed to them, in which they might express their devout desires, did they but know the meaning of them? In a word, are there not post-communions, in which, together with the priest, they might offer up their prayers and praises to God, did they but understand the language of them? Without which, it is impossible for them to join in them; and this they themselves confess, by pretending this disparity between those inspired prayers St. Paul

treats of and their Latin service, *viz.* that in the former the people are obliged to join, but not in the latter; which supposes that they must understand the service they are obliged to join in; and consequently, that they cannot join in the Latin service, because they do not understand it; for could they join in the latter, as well as the former, this disparity could be no reason why the one should not be in a known tongue, as well as the other. In short, we argue that there is the same necessity that the people should understand the stated prayers of the Church, as that they should understand those inspired prayers which St. Paul treats of, because they are obliged to join in one as well as the other. And we confess, say our adversaries, were this reason good, there would be the same necessity; but therefore we assert, that there is not the same necessity, ~~because~~, though we allow they were obliged to join in those inspired prayers, yet we utterly deny that they are obliged to join in the stated prayers of the Church; this must be their sense, or this pretence of disparity between these two sorts of prayer, must be nonsense: and therefore seeing the whole of their service is worded in Latin, which is an unknown tongue to most of their people, it necessarily follows that the most of their people are not obliged to join in any part of it, and consequently in those congregations where neither the priest nor any of the people understand Latin; their prayers are read, and nobody is obliged to pray them; and their worship is performed, and nobody obliged to worship by it; which is a plain confession, that that which they call their public worship, is no worship; or, which is the same thing, a worship that nobody is concerned in, or obliged to.

Thirdly, That the public prayers of the Church have been always looked upon as prayers that were common to the people with the priests; for so it is plain that the public prayers of the temple were common to all the people, and that they joined in them; not only from their responding Amen, at the close of them (as was observed before), but also from several passages of Scripture; such as,* “In his temple doth every one speak of his glory.” And,† “I went with the multitude to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise.” And again,‡ “Exalt him also in the congregation of the people, and praise him in the assembly of the elders.” All which do shew that the people were to join in those public

* Psal. xxix. 9.

† Psal. xlii. 4.

‡ Psal. cvii. 32.

prayers and praises that were offered in the service of the temple. And indeed it was an ancient canon of the Jewish Church (as their own doctors tell us), that "He who prays, ought always, when he prays, to join with the Church:" and they tell us particularly of eighteen prayers in their public service, which the people were every day obliged to pray; or at least, if they were hindered by business, or indisposition of mind, to pray one prayer, which was the summary of them all; and these prayers they were obliged (if they had time) to repeat after the minister of the congregation; as appears by that rule of theirs,* "When a man goes into the synagogue, and finds the assembly praying the additional prayer (that is, a prayer which the minister added to the eighteen, as the close of all) if he is sure he shall begin and end, so that he may answer Amen, after the angel of the Church, let him say his prayers," *i. e.* his eighteen prayers, or at least the summary. And that the Christian, as well as the Jewish people, did always join in the public prayers, might be demonstrated, if it were needful, from innumerable authorities of the Fathers: of which it will be sufficient at present to cite three or four: Justin Martyr† tells us, that in their administration of baptism, "the whole assembly being gathered together, did put up common prayers for themselves, for the baptized person, and for all others throughout the world, with an attentive mind;" and that in their Sunday's service, after they had heard the Scriptures and exhortations, "they rose up together and poured forth their supplications." And that they all joined in the same prayers, is evident, not only from the Apostolic Constitutions,‡ where the substance of the prayer they used in baptism is recorded, under the title of, "The Prayer for the Faithful;" but also from that account which Clemens Alexandrinus gives us of their public worship:§ "The terrestrial altar of the Christians is the assembly of such as join together in prayers, *μὴν ὡσπερ ἔχων φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν καὶ μίαν γνώμην*, having as it were, one voice or sentence; so that there may be properly said to be in the Church, *σύνπνοια*, a breathing together the same breath; for the sacrifice of the Church is the word that ascends as incense from the holy souls, their whole minds together, with their sacrifice, being made known to God." Origen, in answer to Celsus, who charges Christians with using barbarous words

* Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 2. 156, 158.

† Apolog. 2. p. 97, 98. [p. 82, 83. Par. 1742.]

‡ Lib. 8. c. 10. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 469. Lut. Par. 1671.]

§ Strom. 7. p. 717. [p. 848. Venet. 1757.]

in their worship, tells him that it is utterly false, that “the Greeks, in their prayers, used the Greek, the Romans the Latin; and that every one prayed to God, and praised him in his own dialect; and so the Lord of all dialects hears them praying to him in every dialect, expressing, with one voice, in divers tongues, the things which those divers tongues signify; for he prefers not one tongue before another, whether it be Greek or barbarous, as being either ignorant of, or not regarding what is spoken in other languages.”* By which it is evident that Christian assemblies did then, not only pray the same prayers (for otherwise, how could they be said to pray with one voice?) but also that their prayers were all expressed in their own vulgar. St. Cyprian expressly tells us, that “in their assemblies with the brethren, they celebrated the divine sacrifices of prayer and eucharist, together with the priest of God.”† And to name no more, St. Basil in his apologetic epistle for his monks, tells the clergy of Neocæsarea that “at break of day we all in common, as from one mouth and heart, offer a psalm of confession to God, every one making the penitential words his own; and if you shun us for these things, you must shun the Egyptians also, both the Libyas, those of Thebes, Palestine, Arabia, Phœnicia, Syria, and the inhabitants near Euphrates; and in a word, all those that have any esteem for prayers, and vigils, and psalmodies.”‡ Which plainly shews, that it was then the manner of all Christian assemblies, to join together in the same prayer; and that they did not only pray them, but vocally repeat them after the priests, is evident from what he elsewhere tells us; and St. Ambrose from him, *viz.* “That from the prayers of men, women, and children to God, a mixed sound was heard in the Church, as it were of a wave dashing against the shore.”§ A great many more authorities might be produced to this purpose; || but these I think are sufficient to satisfy any modest man, that in the public prayers both of the Jewish and Christian Church, the people were always looked upon as obliged to join and bear their parts: and if in this the Church of Rome be singular from all other Churches (as our authors will have her) the more is her shame; and though this be bad enough, I wish to God it were the only criminal singularity she is guilty of. But,

* Cont. Cels. p. 402. [vol. 1. p. 769. Par. 1733.]

† De Orat. Dom. [ut supra, p. 415.]

‡ Ep. 63. p. 95.

§ Hexam. Hom. 4. To. 1. p. 46. [vol. 1. p. 55. Par. 1839.]

|| See a Treatise in Confutation of the Latin Service.

Fourthly, and lastly, The Church of Rome herself must be forced to own, that the people are obliged to join in her public prayers with the priests, or to confess herself guilty of the highest absurdity ; for both in her Mass and Breviary, the priest is ordered to preface a great part of the prayers with *Oremus*, i. e. " Let us pray." Now I beseech you, who doth the priest mean by *us* ? I cannot think he means himself only, for then he must split himself in twain to make an *us* ; and divide himself by his Christian name, from himself in his surname ; and so Joseph must call to Mumford, " Let us pray ;" and if he means not this (as sure it is not imaginable he should mean so wild an absurdity in such a serious matter) he must mean himself and the people : but then, why should he call upon the people to pray, if they are not obliged to pray with him ? If it be said that he only calls upon the people to pray, but not to join with him in the same prayer ; besides that there can be no reason assigned, why the people should not join in the same prayers ; and a great deal why they should, these prayers containing nothing in them but what is as proper for the people as the priests : besides this, I say, it is evident that the intention of this *Oremus* is, to excite both priests and people to join together in the same prayer ; for the priest speaks to himself, conjunctly with the people, " Let you and I pray ;" and therefore his meaning must be the same to both, but to himself his meaning is to excite himself to pray the following prayer, and therefore it must be the same to the people : as for instance, when in the office of the Vigils of Pentecost, the priest saith, " Let us pray : O God, who hast commanded us, by the mouths of the prophets, to forsake temporal things, and pursue eternal," &c. it is plain that he admonishes himself to pray this very prayer ; because immediately after he is to read a portion of Scripture ; and therefore he must either read one prayer, and pray another, or pray that prayer, or none : and if the meaning of his *Oremus* be to excite himself to pray that prayer, it must be to excite the people to do the same ; which necessarily supposes the people to be obliged to join with the priest in the same prayers, otherwise the *Oremus* signifies nothing ; and indeed, take it at best, it signifies nothing to the generality of the people, few of whom understand the signification of it ; and suppose they all understand that it signifies " Let us pray," yet are they never the wiser for it : for what must they pray ? Why they must pray, *Deus qui nobis per prophetarum ora*, &c. But, good sir, what is that ? Why it is Latin. Is it so ?

Truly had it been Welsh or Arabic, it had been all one ; we understand neither the one nor the other. Understand ! what is that to the purpose ? I tell you, you must pray it, whether you understand it or no. That is a very hard case indeed, for a company of silly souls as we are, to be required to pray we know not what ; or, which is the same thing, to desire and hope for good things *in nubibus*, where we know neither what they are, nor of what importance they are to us ; and the truth of it is, it is not only hard, but impossible ; for seeing it is the knowledge of good things that renders them desirable, how is it possible for men to pray for, or desire of God the good things contained in a prayer, of which they have no knowledge, and which, for all they know, may be a charm instead of a prayer, or an imprecation of mischief, instead of a supplication for mercies. But let this be as it will, it is a plain case, that whenever the priest pronounces his *Oremus* (which he is very frequently obliged to do), he calls upon the people to join with him in the same prayer, which supposes them obliged so to do : and if they are so, it is evident our disparity-makers depart as far from the sense of their own Church, as from the truth, when they tell us that the people were obliged to join in those inspired prayers which St. Paul treats of, but not in the stated liturgy of the Church ; and that therefore there is not the same necessity why the latter should be in a known tongue, as the former.

3rdly, and lastly, Another disparity they make between these two sorts of prayer, is in respect of the languages in which they were expressed. "The Apostle," saith Bellarmine, "speaks of that sort of prayer and giving of thanks, which was performed by the gift of tongues, in some language that was utterly extraneous, which nobody understood, as Arabic or Persic ; and which he who spoke it, many times did not understand ; but he doth not speak of the divine offices, which being composed in Greek, were understood of many ;"* and to the same purpose Fisher,† Vane,‡ and the Rhemists,§ who tell us, "The Apostle condemns a barbarous tongue, but not that which is understood by learned and civil people in every great city, as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin : " and to the same note cants our Scripturist, who is sure never to boggle at an absurdity wherever his master Bellarmine leads the way : "St. Paul," saith he, "doth not so much as mean here to ex-

* De Verb. Dei, lib. 2. c. 16. [ut supra, col. 1.]

† Ibid. p. 372.

‡ Page 358.

§ Annotat. p. 461.

clude the use of such well known tongues as Greek and Latin were ; that is, such as were the languages* well known to all the better bred sort of most nations ; so that here is nothing against the mass said in Latin through the Latin Churches, or in all those western parts, where all knowing and understanding men very commonly know this language." To which I answer :

First, That this pretended disparity perfectly contradicts the two former, *viz.* that the stated prayers of the Church are not designed either to instruct the people, or for the people to join in them ; for both which purposes, those inspired prayers, of which St. Paul discourses, were directly intended ; and therefore, though it was very needful that the people should understand the latter, yet it is altogether indifferent whether they understand the former or no ; and if it be so, it is all one what the unknown language is, whether it be barbarous or civil, Arabic or Greek, or Latin, provided that the priest understands it ; and if he doth not, he may as well officiate mass in Arabic written in Latin characters, as those priests do in Latin, who understand neither Latin nor Arabic. To what purpose therefore do they tell us, that " the Apostle condemns only a barbarous tongue, which nobody understands, but not that which is understood by learned and civil people ?" It is needful or no for the people to understand their prayers ? If not, why should the Apostle condemn a barbarous tongue, which nobody understands, and which nobody needs to understand ? If it be, their two former disparities vanish into air, there being no other imaginable reasons why it should be needful for them to understand their prayers, but only that they be instructed by them, and enabled to join in them. The Apostle, you say, " means to exclude barbarous tongues, such as Persic and Arabic : " and pray why doth he so ? Because nobody understands them : but what need any body understand them ? (and if none need, the Apostle meant to exclude them without reason) unless it be that they may be directed what to pray for, and instructed to join in the prayer ; and if so, then it seems it is needful both that the people should be instructed by, and join in the stated prayers of the Church as well as in those extemporary inspired prayers. And thus to establish a third disparity, you have fairly tript up the heels of the two foregoing : " the Apostle doth not mean,"

you say, "to exclude the use of such well known tongues as Greek and Latin were, which were understood by all the better bred sort of most nations;" and why not these as well as Persic and Arabic? Why, because these are better understood. Ware Hawk, I beseech you! this is a very dangerous reason, and if I may advise you, do not meddle with it; for then it will unluckily follow, not only that public prayers ought to be celebrated in such languages as are best understood (and I am apt to think English in England is better understood than Latin), but also that the people ought (at least those of them that are better bred) to understand their prayers, so that they may be instructed by them, and join in them, and then good night to your two preceding disparities: but this is the common fate of men that are listed to serve a bad cause, that their reasons generally fall foul upon themselves, and instead of encountering their adversaries, run a tilt at one another.

Secondly, That if this objection signify anything, it allows it to be very needful for men of learning and education to understand their prayers, but not for the unlearned, which is notoriously false; for it grants that the Apostle condemns the use of such barbarous tongues in prayer as nobody understands, but not of such as are understood by men of learning and good education: from whence it must follow, either that the Apostle doth needlessly condemn such barbarous languages in public prayer, as the learned do not understand, or that it is needful that the learned should understand the public prayers, but not the unlearned, which is directly contrary to the sense of the Apostle, "Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" Where he plainly condemns the use of an unknown tongue in prayer, not so much for the sake of the learned as the unlearned; for it seems the unknown languages, in which they prayed, were, some of them at least, such as the learned among them did as well understand, and consequently could as well say Amen to, as the learned among us do the Latin prayers in the Roman liturgy. But this would not suffice our Apostle, though it very well suffices our objectors; it is sufficient, they say, that the public prayers be expressed in a language that the learned, in all countries and congregations, understand, and can say Amen to; this is not sufficient, saith the Apostle, the language of

your public prayers ought to be such, as the unlearned as well as the learned understand, and can say Amen to. Here are two contradictory sentences ; which of them is in the right, I leave St. Paul and them to dispute ; but our dapper Touchstone, who, in his Road of Controversies, rarely ventures a step farther than Bellarmine leads him, here thinks he may make as bold to contradict his guide, as he doth to contradict St. Paul ; and truly so far I conceive he is in the right : but then presently after he is as much in the wrong again,* “ For,” saith he, “ St. Paul’s saying, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen ? shew such giving of thanks was not accustomed to be made in the vulgar tongue, and requires, or rather supposes, that in the services of the Church there should be some other to supply the room of the unlearned ; that is, one that should have further understanding of the tongue in which the service of the Church is said ; but had the service been in the vulgar tongue, there needed no man to have supplied the place of the idiot that understandeth not :” so that then it seems they had a learned clerk in every congregation, who perfectly understood that unknown tongue, in which the service of the Church was said, and said Amen to it for the idiots and unlearned ; in which choice period, the good man, to shew his impartiality, contradicts himself as well as Bellarmine ; for a little before, in answer to this text of St. Paul, he very gravely tells us, that† “ there were two kinds of prayer, or giving thanks, in the Church ; the one private, which every man saith by himself alone ; the other public, which the priest saith in the name and person of the whole Church. As concerning private prayer, no Catholic denies that it is very expedient that every man pray in his own tongue, to the end he may understand what he says.” So then it seems the prayer in an unknown tongue, which St. Paul condemns, is only private prayer, which every one saith alone by himself, otherwise to what purpose is all this ? And if so, our clerk’s place will be void again ; for how great plenty of clerks soever there might be in the primitive ages, I can hardly imagine that every one in the congregation had a clerk at his elbow ready to say Amen to his private prayer, as soon as it was finished ; but if the prayer in the first sentence be public (as our author affirms it is, when he calls it the service of the Church), and the same prayer in the second

sentence be a private prayer (as it must be, or the whole must be impertinent), I see no way he hath to vindicate himself from a plain self-contradiction, but to dismiss his distinction and his clerk together. But instead of doing this, in the next paragraph he falls bloodily foul upon the poor ministers of Geneva, for attempting to turn his imaginary clerk out of his desk, by rendering St. Paul's words most deceitfully and maliciously thus :* "He that is an ideot, how shall he say Amen?" instead of "He who supplies the place of an ideot." A wise man, one would think, when he thus lays about him, should make some distinction between his friends and his enemies ; but our wise author here deals his blows at random, and makes no distinction between those hated ministers and his own dear master Bellarmine, but mauls them both together ; for they both agree in the same interpretation, and are equally guilty of interpreting our dear clerk out of his place and function ; for so Bellarmine tells us,† "that those words of the Apostle, *ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου*, according to the Greek phraseology, doth not signify one that acts for, or instead of the ideot, but one that sits in the place of the ideot, or is an ideot, or of the class of the ideots, as St. Chrysostom and Theophylact upon the place ;" of which he gives several instances ; and then in the next paragraph but one, he tells us, that "in the times of the Apostles all the people did respond in the divine offices, and that there was no man constituted to respond for them ;" for which he quotes the afore-cited passage of Justin Martyr, at the end of his second Apology ; and then he goes on to shew, that the same custom was continued for a long while after, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, which he proves unanswerably from St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, and from St. Cyprian's sermon on the Lord's Prayer, and St. Jerome's preface to his second book on the Epistle to the Galatians ; to which, if he had thought fit, he might have added several other authorities : all which our author would have done well to consider, before he fell into those raving fits against the ministers of Geneva ; in which, instead of correcting them, he only forces them to take up the primitive Fathers and his own dear master together, and lashes them most unmercifully upon their backs.

Well then, after all, it seems this objection of our adversaries is as direct a contradiction of St. Paul as of us ; he tells you

* Page 36.

† Ibid. ut supra.

that he means to exclude praying in all such languages as the unlearned do not understand, and therefore cannot say Amen to. No, say our adversaries, by your good leave St. Paul, your meaning is only to exclude praying in such languages as the more learned do not understand ; so that it seems they understand St. Paul's meaning better than St. Paul himself. But why should he mean to exclude such languages only as the more learned do not understand ? Is it because scholars only are obliged to pray ? This I think is such a reason as no Christian will admit. But what other reason can you assign why scholars should understand the language of their prayers, but only this, that thereby they may be the better enabled to pray ? For if they can pray as well without understanding their prayers as with it, there can be no imaginable need why either the learned or unlearned should understand them, and consequently this provision of St. Paul for the learned will be wholly needless and impertinent ; but certainly, if to understand the language of our prayers be an advantage to us in prayer, the unlearned must have an equal right to it with the learned, seeing both are equally obliged to pray ; as for the learned, they understand their prayers as well in the vulgar as in any learned language ; but the unlearned understand them only in their own vulgar. Why then should the unlearned be excluded from this great advantage of understanding their prayers ; whenas, would the Church but give leave, they might enjoy it in common with the learned ? But if there were a necessity of excluding one or the other, I should think it much more charitable to exclude the learned, the other being incomparably the greatest number ; for if the advantage of the hearers be at all to be regarded in the service of the Church, then certainly the advantage of the most hearers is most to be regarded.

Thirdly, That St. Paul condemns the use of an unknown tongue in prayer, not because it is barbarous, but because it is unknown ; and this his reasoning against the use of it doth all along shew, because he that uses it, speaks not to men, because he doth not edify the Church, because his understanding is unfruitful to others, because he doth not teach or instruct others ; and because others, not understanding him, cannot say Amen to him. All which, in other words, amounts to no more than this, because the tongue being unknown can convey no notices of the speaker's mind to the hearers. To what purpose then do these men talk of barbarous and learned languages ? whenas if a man speaks in Latin to those who

understand not Latin, he is far from speaking to them, teaching and edifying them; and if he prays in Latin, his understanding is as unfruitful to them, and they are as far from being able to say Amen to his prayer as if he spoke and prayed in Arabic or Persic. But Latin is a language which all scholars understand. What then? The question is not, whether some or all scholars understand it, but whether the people understand it, of whom the religious assemblies do consist? For if they do not, it is an unknown language after all. There were in some of those Corinthian assemblies such as could interpret the unknown languages that were spoke there, and consequently understood them; notwithstanding which, St. Paul condemns the use of them, because they were unknown to the people. We are told indeed by the sage author of *Protestancy destitute of Scripture-proof*,* “~~that~~.their fixed forms of divine offices are in a language the most certain and the most intelligible, not only in Christendom, but in every auditory.” Which if it be true, the controversy is at an end; for we desire no more but to have the public prayers performed in such a language as is most intelligible to every auditory. But, good Sir, are not your divine offices in Latin? And do you seriously believe that English is not incomparably better understood in our English auditories than Latin? I am sure if you do, your faith is of a peculiar make from all the world’s. But pray, how is it most intelligible? For hitherto this seems to me one of the wildest paradoxes that ever was published to the world. Why you must know it is not intelligible, as all other languages are, by the particular form and articulation of its words. No! then I dare boldly say, it is so intelligible as never any language was since the confusion of languages. But how then, I beseech you? Why, it is “intelligible to every one, by either actions, or ceremonies, or circumstances,” &c. I confess for such an action, to speak so or so, or that this or that is the language of such a ceremony or circumstance, are figurative expressions, common enough in most languages; but for a language to speak, or to be intelligible by actions or ceremonies, is such a scheme of speech as no figure will warrant that I ever yet heard of, unless it be the figure blunder; we will allow your actions, your ceremonies and circumstances to be very significant, and their significations to be very intelligible. But pray what is this to your language? A French shrug, or an Italian

* Page 9.

grimace may be intelligible enough to a man that understands not one word either of French or Italian ; and so may the cringes and bowings, and prostrations of a mass-priest be to the people, though they understand not one word of all the Latin service he recites to them ; but still, if they understand not the language, it is in St. Paul's sense unknown to them, how well soever they understand the ceremonies : and for my life I cannot see how the intelligibility of the actions and ceremonies of their prayers should excuse their expressing them in unintelligible words. For to what end serve these intelligible actions and ceremonies, unless it be to instruct the people ? And in what are they to instruct them, but in the prayers and divine offices to which they appertain ? And if it be needful that the people should be instructed in the prayers (as it must be, or these actions and ceremonies must be needless), I would fain know which is the more likely way to instruct them, whether by dumb signs and shows, or by intelligible words, or whether the people would not better understand the prayers by hearing them pronounced or read in their own language, than by seeing a priest perform the most significant actions or ceremonies of prayer ? And if they would, pray how doth your using the least effectual means to instruct the people, excuse your wilful neglect of the most effectual means ? So that in all this pretence there is nothing but perfect shuffling. The question between you and us is, whether the people understand the language of your prayers ? For if they do not, it is unknown to them, and under that notion is condemned by St. Paul. Some people, you say, do understand it ; that is, one in five hundred perhaps understands it ; and so many, it is probable of the Corinthian people understood Arabic and Persic. Or suppose it were but one in a thousand, the case is still the same. If the generality of the people are the people ; and the generality of our people do no more understand Latin than the generality of the Corinthians did Arabic or Persic, the one as well as the other must be an unknown tongue to the people ; and if it be so, I see no way you have, after all your tricking, shuffling, and doubling, to justify your Latin service, but by appealing from St. Paul's authority.

Fourthly, and lastly, That supposing the people did understand Latin when they hear it, yet this will not at all excuse their muttering their Latin prayers in so low a voice that the people cannot hear them. The Representer tells us, that if their prayers were in their mother-tongue, he should receive but

little advantage by it, because the greatest part is said in so low a voice that it is not possible he should hear it. And if this be true, I am fully of his mind, because words which he doth not hear, can doubtless signify no more to him than words which he doth not understand. But this is only excusing one fault by another; for if it be a fault to perform the public prayers in an unknown tongue, it is doubtless as great a fault to perform them in an unheard tongue, seeing what is unheard must be unknown. But why do they mutter them in so low a voice, contrary to the current sense and practice of the Primitive Church? I confess, if the language of them be unknown to the people (as I doubt it is), it is no great matter how low the voice is in which they are pronounced; for to what end should the people hear that which they cannot understand? But if they do understand a Latin prayer when they hear it (as some of their bolder sort of authors would fain insinuate they do), I am sure they do not understand it when they hear it not. An unknown language in public prayer is forbid because it hinders the people from understanding the prayers; and in my opinion, it is as hard for the people to understand the prayers in a known language, when they do not hear it, as in an unknown language when they do hear it: but if they can understand it, notwithstanding they neither know the language, nor hear the words of it, truly they are much greater conjurors than ever I took them for.

And thus, I think, I have returned a full answer to all the cavils of our adversaries, the very best of which are so very thin and transparent, that if I might advise them, they should tamper no more with 1 Cor. xiv. And seeing there is no persuading St. Paul, either by fair means or foul, to be reconciled to their practice, even to let him alone for the future to abound in his own sense; and this some of their own authors have judged the most advisable course, who having tried all manner of artifice to vex and torture the text into a compliance with their Church's service, and all to no purpose, were at last forced to betake themselves to this resolution, that* "the Church doth not at all offend in departing from this institution of St. Paul, it being left free to the Church, not only to violate this institution of St. Paul, but also the institution of God himself, supposing it to have been once profitable to the Church, but now unprofitable." And this I confess is a full Catholic

* Vid. Hoftmeist. in 1 Cor. xiv. p. 272.

answer, not only to what St. Paul, but also to what God himself hath said, or can say. But before they attribute to their Church such an exorbitant authority over the word of God, it concerns them to beware, lest while they seek to evade St. Paul's authority, they verify his prophecy in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, where he tells us, "that the day of Christ shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

BOOK IV.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME JUSTLY CON-
DEMNED, AS DIRECTING PRAYERS TO SAINTS AND
ANGELS.

A DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

AMONGST many other very corrupt and erroneous doctrines of the Romanists, the Church of England in her twenty-second Article, condemns that of Invocation of Saints, as a “fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God ;” and in her learned homily against the Peril of Idolatry, passes yet a much severer censure upon it, and makes all those that believe and practise it, “guilty of the same idolatry that was amongst Ethnics and Gentiles.” How sharp soever this charge may be thought to be, it is, you see, the plain sense and judgment of our Church, and what I believe is the truth, and no hard matter to make good.

To proceed therefore in the easiest and clearest method I can, I propose to sum up all that I think needful to be said upon it, under these following heads :

I. What is the professed doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome as to Invocation of Saints.

II. On what occasion it began and spread in the Church.

III. That there is not the least proof for it from Scripture.

IV. That there is no proof for it from the Fathers of the first three hundred years, and more.

V. That there is full and evident proof in Scripture against it.

VI. That the Fathers of the first and purest ages, till after three hundred, are all express and positive in their writings against it.

VII. That the doctrine and practice of Saint-invocation is impious and idolatrous.

I.

What is the professed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome, as to Invocation of Saints ?

AN account of this I shall give you first in general, as it is set down in the decree of the Trent Council, and then lay it before you more at large distributed under several particulars.

In the twenty-fifth session of that packed synod, we have its decree in these words: "That all bishops and pastors, that have the care of souls, do diligently instruct their flock, that it is good and profitable, humbly to pray unto the saints, and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and aid." And then to reinforce the obligation of it, it denounces an anathema against all those who shall find fault with it, or refuse to practise it; so that now, whosoever shall be so hardy as to think and teach the contrary, to say, that either it ought not to be done, or that it is a foolish thing to do it; that the practice is little less than idolatry, repugnant to the doctrine of the Scriptures, hugely derogatory to the glory of God, as sole Governor of the world, and highly injurious to the honour of Christ, as the only Mediator betwixt God and man, does, in the judgment of that Church, think impiously; and if the Pope's power, as well as his infallibility, does not fail him, he must be cursed and damned for it. But, for once, not to be frightened with his vain thunder, I shall proceed, in due place, by God's assistance, to prove all the foregoing particulars against it, when I have given you yet a fuller description of it. First then :

1. The least and most excusable thing in this doctrine and practice is, to pray to saints to pray for them. Thus much is not only confessed by them, but made the pretence to bring off this doctrine without the charge of idolatry and creature-worship: We do no more, in praying to saints departed, say they, than one living Christian does to another, when he says, Pray, sir, pray for me, or remember me in your prayers. But was this indeed the true meaning of such devotions, it is so far from being any justification of them, that the apology itself is sinful; and admitting the excuse, the practice no less to be condemned. For,

When they pray to saints departed to pray for them, those saints do either hear their prayers, and become acquainted with their desires, or they do not: if they do hear all those

prayers that are put up to them at the same time by innumerable persons, and that in far distant places, what is this but to ascribe to them that ubiquity and omnipresence, that is solely, peculiarly, and incommunicably in God? If they do not, then it is very absurd and ridiculous, and a great abuse of that reason God hath given men for other ends than to trifle with, to pray to them. For, to what purpose should they pray to them that cannot hear them? Why should they beseech those to be their advocates to God, and recommend their particular cases to him, whose cases they cannot, by any way that we know of, come to understand? As for their learning and seeing all things in the glass of the Trinity, or learning them by particular revelation from God; as God has declared no such thing to us, so is it not to be known by the light of nature, but the contrary is very probable, if not certain; as shall be made to appear by the sequel of this discourse. It is not denied but that blessed spirits, who are safely landed upon the shore, do pray for their partners who are still behind beating it on the waves; it is not denied but that saints in heaven may pray in particular to God for their friends and relations, whose necessities and infirmities they were well acquainted with before they left the body: so it was agreed betwixt St. Cyprian and Cornelius, that who went first to glory, should be mindful of the other's condition to God; for why should their memories or their charity be thought to be less in heaven, than they were on earth? We know it was the practice of some good men in the primitive times, to recommend themselves to the prayers of the saints; that is, to desire God to hear the prayers that the saints in heaven did make in their behalf; and to apply themselves to the martyrs a little before their suffering, when they themselves were entered into bliss, to intercede with God for those who were yet on the way passing thither with fear and trembling. But now is there no difference betwixt the saints' intercessions for us, and our invocation of them? Betwixt their praying for us in heaven, and our praying to them on earth? Is there no difference betwixt one living Christian praying to another to pray for him, who hears his request, and who is acquainted with his condition, and our addressing to saints departed to pray for us, who know us not, and who are ignorant of our state?

Again, when they pray to saints departed, they do it with all the rites and solemnities of a religious worship, in sacred offices, upon their knees, with uncovered head, with hands and

eyes lifted up, in times and places dedicated to God's worship ; now, though it should be true, that they do no more than pray to saints to pray for them : yet doing it in that manner, with such external acts of devotion that are confessed to be the same wherewith we call on God, I do not see how they can be excused, even on this account, from attributing that honour to the creature, which is due only to the Creator. As God is owned to be infinite in himself, and to have incommunicable perfections, so there ought to be some peculiar and appropriate acts and signs of worship to signify, that we do inwardly so esteem and believe of God : and when these are once determined by the law of God, or the universal reason and consent of mankind, the applying them to any else but him, is a plain, violating his peculiarities, and robbing him of his honour. And now in this respect also I cannot discern how the Romish invocation of saints is of the same nature with our requesting our fellow-members to pray for us. For (not to mention again the presence of these, and the absence of the other), is there no difference betwixt my desiring an eminently good Christian to pray for me, and falling down on my knees, with hands and eyes lifted up, and that in a temple to him, with that request ? Would not every good man, that has any regard for the honour of God, presently shew his detestation of such an action ? Would he not say to me, as St. Peter to Cornelius falling down before him, "Staud up, I myself also am a man ?" Would he not, with St. Paul, have rent his garments, and with much holy indignation cried out to me, as he to the men of Lystra, designing the same honours to him and Barnabas, wherewith they worshipped their gods, "Why do ye these things ? we also are men of like passions with you." As the saints in heaven cannot be supposed to lose anything of their love and charity towards their fellow-members by going thither ; so neither can they be thought to abate anything of their zeal and fervour for the honour of God ; and therefore certainly what they did and would have refused here on earth, they must, with higher degrees of abhorrence, reject now they are in heaven.

Moreover, if this be all they mean by all their several offices of devotions to saints departed, that they should pray for them unto God, why in all this time that these forms have been complained of, has not the sense of them been better expressed ? Whence, I pray, shall we take the meaning of such prayers, but from the usual signification of the words ? But if not,

why has no inquisition passed upon them? Why have not the grossest and rankest for superstition, and encroaching on the prerogative of God, been expunged and blotted out? Why all this while has there been no review, no comments upon them, no cautions and instructions written and bound up with their Breviaries, Rosaries and Hours, that the people might know how to understand them? If the form of words in their saint-invocation be the same that is used to God, but their sense and meaning otherwise; why don't they tell this to the world, and make their explication as public and as general as the prayers?

Certainly, the bishops and governors of the Romish Church, and those that have the care of souls amongst them, are either guilty of gross and wilful neglects to the people, or else, whatever they say to us, ~~their~~ ^{their} will is, that the people should understand those prayers according to the customary and received use of the words; and then I am sure they pray, not only to saints to pray for them unto God, in order to the obtaining of him such aids and supplies as they want, but to saints themselves for those very blessings: as will appear at large in the next particular.

2. They pray to saints departed for those very blessings that none but God can give. To what purpose else do they advise us to fly, not only to their prayers, but "their help and assistance;" * which words, "help and assistance," would have been altogether superfluous, was not something else meant by them, than only that of their prayers.

To what purpose else do they pray to them to "visit" them,† "to make haste and come" to them, did they not expect some other aid and assistance from them, than bare praying for them? For that certainly might have been better and more conveniently performed in heaven, before the face of God.

To what purpose else, in some particular cases, do they put up their addresses to one saint, rather than to another, according as in this world they were famous, either for some eminent grace shining in them, or for some strange cure, or extraordinary deliverance wrought by them, but only that they believe and trust, that those who did such great things on earth, are much more willing and able to do them now they are in

* *Opem Auxiliumque Trid. Con. sess. 25.* [Labbe, *Concil.* vol. 14. p. 895. *Lut. Par.* 1672.]

† *Propere veni, accelera.*

heaven, where, while other graces cease, charity and beneficence are perfected and abide for ever?

Thus because St. Roche was signally charitable in assisting those who were infected with the plague, therefore do they call upon him in times of infection; because St. Apollonia had all her teeth struck out for her undaunted confession of the faith of Jesus, therefore do they fly to her for ease against the rage of teeth; because St. George was by profession a soldier, and renowned for wonderful achievements, therefore have they recourse to him for assistance against enemies. It is true, was it lawful to address to any at all, this might be a sufficient reason, why they address to this rather than to another saint, because his or her former actions or sufferings do best suit and befit their present case; but being not sure that these and such-like canonized saints of the Romish Church, are saints in heaven; being sure, if they are, they cannot hear us, nor know our particular state, much less bestow health and deliverance upon us, whilst we love and honour the memory of saints indeed, we ought to call only upon God, who only "is a present help in time of need," and "the Saviour of them that put their trust in him."

But to put this out of doubt, it will not be amiss to set down some of their forms of devotion to saints departed: and here, not to rake for them in some obscure authors, that have privately stole into the world, I shall need go no farther than the present Roman Breviary, corrected and published by the decree and order of the Council of Trent. The blessed Virgin is there invoked in the feast of the Assumption, "for strength against enemies;" and in the hymn frequently used in her office, she is not only called "the gate of heaven," but intreated to "loose the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the blind, to drive away our evils, to obtain good things for us, and to shew herself to be a mother" (that is, as the Mass-book of Paris, 1634, interprets it),* "in right of a mother to command her son." In another place she is sued to "for help to the miserable, for strength to the weak, for comfort to the afflicted, and that all that celebrate her festivals may feel her assistance:" and but that I

* O felix puerpera, nostra pians scelera, jure matris impera Redemptori. Dall. de Cultu Latin. [Adv. Latin. de Rel. Cult. Objecto.] lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 359. [Genev. 1664.] Not denied by Natalis Alexander, though he answers this citation of Daille, only he says, Non est ab Ecclesia probata, et quibusdam tantum missalibus olim inserta est. Hist. Eccl. Sec. 5. dissert. 5. [dissert. 25.] p. 343, 347. [vol. 9. p. 773. Bing. ad Rhen. 1787.]

said I would not hunt for matter, I could send you to authors of theirs, and not of the least note, where we may read such blasphemy as this: "that God hath given the Virgin Mary half of his kingdom."* "That the prayers made to, and by the saints, are better than those made by Christ."† "That the mother's milk is equally to be esteemed with the son's blood."‡ This you may take for a taste of that *hyperdulia*, that super-refined service, which they put up to the blessed Virgin; and yet that to the Apostles, and other saints of less magnitude, comes not much behind it; St. Peter is entreated, by the power given to him, "to hear their prayers, to untie the bonds of their iniquity, and to open the gates of heaven:" all the Apostles,§ "to absolve them from their sins, by their command to heal all their spiritual maladies, and to increase their virtues."|| St. Andrew is supplicated "for patience, to bear cheerfully the cross of Christ;" St. Francis "for deliverance from the drudgery and bondage of sin;" St. Bridget "for wisdom against the snares of the world," St. Nicholas "for courage against the assaults of the devil;" St. Agnes "for the chiefest of graces, that of charity;" and St. Catharine "for all graces:" we are taught to pray to be delivered from hell, and to be made partakers of heaven by their merits;¶ to fly to them as our patrons and advocates, to put confidence in their intercessions, and to ascribe our mercies and deliverances to their power and interest in God. In the office of visitation of the sick, the priest laying his hand upon the head of the sick person, prays,** "that Jesus the son of Mary, and Saviour of the world, would for the merits and intercession of his holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all saints, be gracious and merciful to him:" and in another place in the same office, that†† "through the intercession of the blessed Virgin and all saints, he might obtain eternal life." These are enough; but I cannot omit one more, which is a flower indeed; in the office about the sacrament of penance, there is found this remarkable prayer,‡‡ "The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Virgin Mary, and of all saints, and whatsoever good thou hast done, and whatsoever evil thou hast suf-

* Biel. in Can. Mis. Sect. 80.

† Salmeron in 1 Tim. 2. disc. 8.

‡ Carol. Scrib. in Amph. hon.

§ Commun. p. 29.

|| Chemn. exemp. Invocat. Sanct. p. 146.

¶ Breviar. et Miss.

** Ritual. de Visit. Infirm.

†† Meritis et intercessione S. S.

‡‡ Ritual. Rom. de Sacram. pœnit. [Passio Domini nostri Jesu Christi, merita Mariæ Virginis, et omnium Sanctorum, et quicquid boni feceris, et mali sustinueris sunt tibi in remissionem peccatorum, augmentum gratiæ, præmium vitæ æternæ. Amen. P. 44. Venet. 1663.]

ferred, be to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life." And now let the reader judge, if this be not to give the creature that worship that is due only to the Creator, and to seek to obtain those blessings from finite beings, and through their procurement, which only Almighty God, and his blessed Son Jesus Christ, can give unto men.

3. It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that mental* prayers as well as vocal, are to be put up to saints departed: so the Trent Council decreed; so their bishops and pastors are enjoined to teach the people, and so they practise, this being a form of prayer to saints, in frequent use amongst them, "with the desire of our hearts we pray unto you, regard the ready service of our minds:" so that according to them, saints departed do not only hear our prayers, but know our hearts also; and indeed this is necessarily implied in every prayer that is made to them, *viz.* that they not only hear the prayer, but know the disposition of the heart from whence it proceeds, otherwise the hypocritical supplicant must be supposed as likely to obtain their favour as the sincerest votary.

4. They not only pray to them with mental and vocal prayer, but

They confess their sins to them. Very remarkable is that form of confession in the reformed Roman Missal:† "I confess to Almighty God, to the ever-blessed Virgin, to blessed Michael Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, brethren, that I have sinned in thought, word, and deed."

They make vows to them; nothing is more common than at entrance into some religious orders, thus to express their devotion, "I vow to God and the blessed Virgin;" then to vow that their whole life shall be devoted to the blessed Virgin, or some other saint,‡ according to that famous pattern, "I humbly beg of thee, O mother of all clemency, that thou wouldest vouchsafe to admit me into the number of those who have devoted themselves to thee, to be thy perpetual servants." Another of this kind, not much inferior to it, we meet in Horstius,§ *viz.* "I firmly resolve henceforth to serve thee and thy Son with all faithfulness, and for ever to cleave to thee."

* Voce vel mente supplicare. [Labbe, ut supra.]

† Ordinar. Missæ, p. 217.

‡ Francis. Albertin. de Angel. Custod. p. 224.

§ Horst. in Dedic. Sect. 2. p. 83.

They offer up laud and praise to them, and entreat them to hear and receive their thanksgivings; thus to St. James they pray,* “that he would joyfully hear the acknowledgments that as right and due they paid to him.” It is usual with their learned men, to conclude their books with “praise to God and the blessed Virgin,” particularly Valentia and Bellarmine; the latter of which thus ends his book concerning the worship of saints:† “Praise be to God and to the blessed Virgin, also to Jesus Christ.” Horstius before had it, “thee and thy Son;” Bellarmine here, “the blessed Virgin,” and then “Jesus Christ;” whereby we may see they give her not only an equal part with God in their praises, but placing her before Christ,‡ seem to give her somewhat of pre-eminence above him.

5. They appoint angels and saints deputies and lieutenants under God in the government of the world, and stick not to make them guardians, patrons, and patronesses over particular kingdoms, cities, churches, and single persons. The Scripture indeed frequently speaks of the knowledge, presence, dignity, occasional ministry, and embassies of holy Angels; but that delegation of power the Romanists give them, whereby they make them share empire and dominion with God in the government of the world, can be as little proved of them, as of saints departed; however, I am chiefly to consider their doctrine and practice in reference to the latter; they teach the people§ to make choice of one or more out of the number of the saints, to be their patron; to love them, to imitate them, through their hands to offer daily their works to God, to commend themselves to their protection at all times, especially in difficulties and temptations. They give to one saint this precinct, and to another that; to one, power over this malady; over that, to others: more of this you have drawn to the life in the forementioned excellent homily of our Church against idolatry,|| out of which I shall only cull some passages, and refer the reader for farther satisfaction to the homily itself: it compares such saints in the Roman Church, to whom they allot the defence of certain countries, to the *Dii Tutelares* of the Gentile idolaters; such to whom the safety of certain cities are committed, to their *Dii Presides*; and such to whom

* Brev. Rom. in fest. S. Jacob.

† Bellar. de cul. Sanct. Ludg. Edit.

‡ Laus Deo virginique Mariæ, Jesu item Christo.

§ Horst. parad. Animæ, Sect. 2.

|| Homil. of Idolat.

temples and churches are builded, and altars erected, to their *Dii Patroni*: it tells us "that the Romanists have no fewer saints than the heathens had gods, to whom they gave the honour due to God: every artificer and profession has his special saint as a peculiar god: for example, scholars have St. Nicholas and St. Gregory; painters, St. Luke; neither lack soldiers their Mars; nor lovers their Venus, amongst Christians. The sea and waters, amongst the Romanists, as well as cities and countries, have their special saints to preside over them, as amongst the heathens they had gods; all diseases have their special saints as gods, the curers of them; the pox, St. Roche; the falling-evil, St. Cornelis; the tooth-ache, St. Apollonia; neither do beasts and cattle lack their gods with us; for St. Loy is the horse-leech, and St. Anthony the swine-herd, &c. Where is God's providence and due honour in the mean time? Who saith, the heavens be mine, the earth is mine, the whole world, and all that therein is; but we have left him neither heaven nor earth, nor water, nor country, nor city, peace nor war, to rule and govern; neither men nor beasts, nor their diseases to cure; and as if we doubted of his ability or will to help, we join to him another helper, as if he were a noun adjective, using these sayings; such as learn, God and St. Nicholas be my speed; such as sneeze, God help and St. John; to the horse, God and St. Loy save thee: thus are we become like horses and mules that have no understanding: O heavens! O earth! What madness and wickedness against God are men fallen into! What dishonour do the creatures their Creator and Maker! This is not written to reproach the saints, but to condemn the foolishness and wickedness of men, who make of the true servants of God, false gods, by attributing to them the power and honour which is God's, and due to him only."

II.

On what occasion this Doctrine and Practice began and spread in the Church.

GREAT was the honour the Primitive Christians had for their martyrs and confessors; they frequented their tombs, erected altars on the places of their burial, highly esteemed their bones and relics: here they rehearsed their good works done in their lifetime, and their faith, patience and constancy shewed at death: here they blessed God for that grace that

was given to them, and for that good that accrued to themselves by their example : here they proposed their virtues for imitation, and had their own piety and zeal inflamed by the remembrance of them ; and the Christian cause being then harassed on every side by implacable enemies, the malice of the Jew, and the subtlety of the Greek, and the power of the Roman, combining with their united force to destroy and root it up, it pleased God, not only by the demonstration of a Divine power in the Apostles, and their immediate successors, whilst they were alive, but also by many wonderful things done at their tombs, when they were dead, and by sensibly answering prayers that were there put up to him, to confirm the truth of Christianity, to declare his approbation of the sufferings of his servants, and to encourage others to seal the doctrine of the Gospel with their blood, as they had done. To them, in a particular manner, may that of the Apostle be applied,* “ Whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son ; and whom he did predestinate, them he also called ; and whom he called, them he also justified ; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.” The Apostle having said in the verse before,† “ We know that all things work together for good unto them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose ;” adds, as a proof of what he had said, “ whom he did foreknow,” would be persons of great and noble minds, and so fit for the work ; “ them he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son,” them he did decree to suffer for his sake, and by sufferings to be made conformed to his Son, who was made perfect through sufferings ; “ and whom he did predestinate, them he also called ;” them in due time, he actually called forth to suffer for his name ; “ and whom he called, them he also justified,” them he approved of as faithful servants, as loyal soldiers, as invincible champions of truth and righteousness ; and “ whom he justified, them he also glorified ;” them he crowned with honour and renown here, and with immortal glory hereafter. This was the testimony God bore to the Apostles and first bishops of the Church, to the authority they had received, to the doctrine they taught, and for which they died : this was the honour the Primitive Christians deservedly shewed to their victorious martyrs ; they did not invoke them, but loved their memories, commemorated their

* Rom. viii. 29, 30.

† Ver. 28.

virtues, and blessed God for their example; they performed to them not any part of religious worship that was due to God only, but (as they called it)* “an officious worship, a worship of love and society, a special and particular observance, a respect convenient and proper,” and which they could not but think was due to them on the account of the great service they had done to the cause of Christ, and the more than ordinary worth and excellency that shined in them.

But afterwards, in succeeding ages, when through the good providence of God, and favour of Constantine the Great, the Church had rest and ease, and prosperity began to dawn upon it; the devil, finding he could not prevail over the Christian faith by fiery trials and temptations, betook himself to other more secret, it may be, but equally dangerous stratagems; and by working on the strong inclinations and affections of men to ease and softness, he too successfully attempted to deprave and corrupt it by loose and superstitious doctrines: most men are for some kind of religion, whether the devil will or no; which, because he cannot hinder, he labours what he can it may be such, that whilst it pretends fair, may do them but little good; and men are forward enough to close with that which offers at carrying them to heaven on the easiest terms. The Church being now out of persecution, and riches and honours attending that profession, for which such multitudes had lost all, and endured the flames, the people began to be more loose and vain in their conversations, than when they still expected martyrdom: now they began to place their religion in shows and pretences, more than in a sincere and substantial piety: and whereas before they were wont to frequent the tombs of the martyrs, that at the sight of the place their affections might be raised, their devotions enlivened, and their faith and charity receive farther degrees of warmth and heat from their burning and shining examples, now they placed all their religion in the bare outward observance of that solemnity, and took more care to honour the saints by their lofty praises and commendations of them, than to become saints themselves by imitating their graces and virtues; and that what was wanting in the one, they might make up in the other, they now began to fall into many superstitious conceits and opinions

* *Cultus officiosus, dilectionis, et societatis, specialis observantia.* St. Aust. *contr. Faust.* l. 20, 21. [vol. 8. p. 347. Par. 1688.] *οὐ λατρευτικῶς, ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς.* Cyril. l. 6. *contr. Jul.* [p. 203. Lutet. 1638.]

concerning them, to break out into too lavish and indeed extravagant expressions of their worth, and to fly too high in their panegyrics and laudatory orations. Now they began,

To attribute the miracles done at the martyrs' tombs to the martyrs' own power, or at least, mediation with God; the common people observing, that many cures were wrought upon those, that at those monuments applied themselves to God, were led by degrees to look upon them as so many testimonies of the martyrs' great interest in the court of heaven, and instead of begging relief of God, to speak directly to the martyrs themselves :

To fancy that the souls of martyrs were always hovering about their tombs and ashes, and so joined their intercessions with the prayers of Christians that were put up to God in those places; so it was objected by Vigilantius to St. Jerome :

To wish that the martyrs would pray for them; so they cried out in the Council of Chalcedon;* "Let Flavius pray for us;" and in Theodoret's history of the lives of the Fathers, we find in the close of most of them (though some think them not to be his words, but additions and insertions afterwards), "I wish and desire, that by their intercession I may obtain Divine help:"

To commend themselves to the † martyrs' intercessions, to beg to be heard for their sakes, to be helped by their prayers, to be vouchsafed the effects of the prayers that were made by them in behalf of the Church below :

To pray to them, upon supposition if they heard or knew what was done here below:‡ "Hear, O thou soul of great Constantius," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "if thou hast any understanding of these things:" the like he hath in his funeral oration which he made upon his sister Gorgonia;§ "If thou hast any care of things done by us, and holy souls, receive this honour from God; that they have any feeling of such things as these, receive this oration of ours."

By such steps and degrees as these, the frequenting the places where the martyrs were enshrined, and honouring their names and memories, was turned into superstitious devotion, and that soon ended in solemn and downright invocation.

* Oret pro nobis Flavianus.

† Commendare nos orationi, St. Aust.

‡ Εἰ τις αἰσθῆσις, Nazian. Orat 3. in Julian. [vol. 1. p. 50. Par. 1630.]

§ εἰ δὲ τις σοι καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐστὶ λόγος. Orat. und. in Gorgon. [Ibid. p. 189.]

To all this we may add, what a learned * author of our own has ingeniously guessed, that the great compliance and yielding of the Roman Christians in this particular, to those northern nations the Goths and Vandals, when they invaded and over-ran the empire, did not a little contribute to raise and propagate this saint-worship and invocation in the Church : of all the heathen nations, none were more zealously devoted to the worship of dæmons than those were ; whereof he gives many testimonies : now it is not improbable that the Christians, to mollify their fierce natures, and to induce them the more readily to embrace Christianity, might indulge them still in that practice, excepting only the object of their worship, giving them real saints and holy angels, instead of their feigned and impure deities ; and that which makes this the more probable is, that their invasion and stay in Italy, and the rise and growth of dæmon-worship there, jump exactly as to time, and both bear date from the fourth and fifth centuries.

III.

That there is not the least proof for it from Scripture.

1. AND here we are first to take notice, that it is freely confessed by some of their own † learned divines, that there is no express text, either in the Old or New Testament, for this doctrine and practice ; and is it not hard to make that an article of faith, that has no foundation to stand on in the word of God ? Or, to make that a duty, that has no law nor sanction to bind us to the practice of it ? Were not the Scriptures written “ to make men wise unto salvation,” and “ to instruct them thoroughly unto all good works ?” ‡ Were they not written “ that we might believe, and believing might have life ?” § Do not the Apostles say, “ they have made known to men the whole will of God, and kept nothing hid from them ?” Do they not abound in earnest exhortations to “ pray,” to “ pray always,” to “ pray without ceasing,” “ with all prayer ?” Have they not left frequent directions for the right performance of it, in a language that all that hear may understand, “ with pure hands, in faith, without wrath and doubting ?” || And now can we

* Dr. Tenison.

† Bellar. de Sanct. beat. c. 19. [vol. 2. p. 412. Prag. 1721.] Salm. in 1 Tim. 2. disp. 7. Eckius Enchirid. de vener. Sanct. c. 15. Cardin. du Perron.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 15. [17.]

§ John xx. [31.]

1 Cor. xiv.

imagine, after all this, that had invocation of saints been so good and profitable a duty, or that it had been so great a crime so much as to doubt of the blessed Virgin's* merits and ability to help, that they would have been wholly silent as to this matter? Were not the Apostles guided by the Holy Spirit of God? Must they not be supposed to have as hearty a concern, and as burning a zeal, for the salvation of souls, and the glory of God, as the Trent Fathers had? And now, had this practice been so highly instrumental to promote both these, as that Synod would have us believe, is it to be imagined, that every one of them would have quite forgot it, and neglected to have given it in charge, with as much strictness as they have done to all bishops and pastors, to instruct their flocks in the piety and usefulness of it? Have not the Apostles, both by their precept and example, enjoined Christians to beg the prayers of one another, whilst they are in the body? Have they not prescribed to the sick man as the most sovereign receipt, to have recourse to the prayers † of the elders of the Church? What reason then can be given, that we have not any one example or precept to fly to the prayers of saints departed, to their help and assistance, as the more prevailing and meritorious, but only this, that they are not in a capacity to hear our requests, or to know our conditions? Nay, had our Saviour and his Apostles intended this saint-invocation as a necessary Christian duty, it would have needed a more express command and penalty to have enforced its obligation, than most other duties of Christianity, since it was altogether a thing new to the Jews, and what had never been practised by them; for though sometimes in their prayers to God, they besought him to remember ‡ Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; that is, § his own covenant and promise he had made with and to them, yet they never used them as intercessors, or said, holy Abraham, or holy Isaac, pray for us.

But to blunt the edge of this argument, that they themselves have put into our hands against it, they tell us, it was not for any intrinsic evil in the thing, but for some particular reasons relating to the times of the Old Testament, and the first ages of the New, that it was not mentioned and enjoined in Scripture; but if the reasons produced by them do hold with equal force against it, promiscuously in all ages, as well as against it

* Catech. Rom. 584.

‡ Luke i. 55, 72, 73.

† James v. 14.

§ Deut. vii. 8.

then, certainly the main reason why it is nowhere prescribed in Scripture is, that it might at no time be put in practice. The reasons they give are chiefly two.

For the Old Testament, they say it is not there enjoined, because the patriarchs and saints departed, during that dispensation, were not admitted into the beatific vision, and so could not ordinarily understand the prayers of the living; but if, for ought we know, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are still in the same limbo, or place of rest, they went to at first, or if our Saviour, at his ascension into heaven, did give them a happy deliverance, and took them up with him into the immediate presence of God, it is not certain that they understand the desires of the living any more than they did before: then there is as much reason not to invoke them now, as there was not to do it then. Many of the Romanists will not have the saints in heaven come to know the desires of their living votaries by the benefit of the beatific vision which they enjoy, but by particular revelation from God; and if so, then the Old Testament worthies were as capable of it, and consequently there was as much reason to pray unto them before our Saviour's coming, when they were but in paradise, as afterwards, when by his glorious victory and triumph over death, they were exalted into heaven, since God could have revealed the requests of their supplicants alike to them in all places, in one as well as another; besides, considering the great esteem and veneration the Jews ever had for those great men, the founders of their nation, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, and others, had there been no evil in the thing, no reason can be given why it was not preached to the Jews by our Saviour and his Apostles, as the most likely argument to win them to embrace the Christian religion.

For the New Testament, they say it is not there enjoined, because it would have been a great offence and scandal to the new converted Gentiles, and have given them an occasion to think that they had only changed their gods, but not their religion, that the Christian doctrine was only a device of the Apostles, to thrust out their old dæmons and heroes, and to put in themselves; that as those had hitherto been worshipped for the great services and benefactions they did in this present world, so they for the future might have the same honour done them for the full discoveries they had made, and excellent directions they had given, relating to a future and more happy state.

And is not this a good argument, and does it not hold still against Romish invocation? Is it not of as much force now to cast it out of the Church, as it was then not to bring it in? Does it not give infinite offence to a great part of the Christian world; and is it not esteemed, and that justly, by them to be the old Pagan worship revived, or something very near it? For it is not enough to excuse them from it, that the object of their invocation is not the same; that they do not with them pay this worship to the heathen deities (who, though in some respects they had been patrons and benefactors to their country, were yet in others very lewd and unworthy persons), but to the Apostles of Christ and Christian martyrs (who in all respects were highly deserving of the world), whilst they agree in the same act and kind of worship, and give that honour to the creature, which properly and peculiarly belongs to God; and herein especially did the Pagan worship and superstition consist.

2. We shall now examine the chief of those texts the Romanists produce in the behalf of this doctrine, and let you see how little they serve to that purpose.

The first is, Luke xv. 7, 10, "There shall be joy in heaven;" and again, "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." From whence they argue, that if angels and blessed spirits rejoice at the conversion of a sinner, they must know and understand this change that is wrought in them, before they can rejoice at it; and if the knowledge of their repentance reaches them, why not also of their prayers; and then if they can hear their prayers, why may they not be prayed unto? To this it is answered:

That this rejoicing in heaven is not for the conversion of a particular sinner, but in general for the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; and this appears more than probable from the parable of the lost sheep, immediately going before, whereof these words are the conclusion; the ninety-nine sheep not lost, are the angels persevering in their first state of innocence; the sheep that went astray, Adam, and in him all his posterity that fell from God; the Shepherd that went to seek the lost sheep, God himself, who sent his Son into the world to seek and to save that which is lost, on whose shoulders the great work of man's redemption was laid; and for this we are sure there was joy in heaven, when a blessed choir of angels sung that heavenly anthem at Christ's nativity, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." But,

Supposing this rejoicing is to be understood for the repentance of individual sinners, it may be observed, that this joy is not said to be the joy of angels, but* “before the angels;” intimating that this rejoicing is not to be attributed to the angels, but to God, in whose presence they stand; and this exposition is countenanced by considering that it is God that answers to the shepherd in the parable; as he went to seek his strayed sheep, and rejoiced at the finding of it, so it is God, that by his grace and mercy in Christ, recovered man, and rejoiced at the accomplishment of his own work. Again,

If this text does imply, that angels in heaven know when a sinner is converted, and rejoice at it; it does not follow that they know this by some excellent privilege and perfection of their nature, whereby also they are enabled to understand even those mental prayers that we are told ought to be put up to them; but passing always betwixt heaven and earth (as was represented unto Jacob in his divine vision, on God’s errands and embassies), those that ascend from earth may tell the joyful news of converted sinners to them in heaven; but they that tell them this, cannot also acquaint them with the inward secret desires and cogitations of men’s hearts, being in a capacity, by observing in men the signs and fruits of true repentance, to know the one, but having no way, by their own natural power, to understand the other.

The second place is, Matth. xxii. 30, where our Saviour says, that “the just, at the resurrection, shall be as the angels in heaven;” from whence they infer, that if our prayers and concerns are known to the angels, and they on that account may be invocated; why should they not be known also to the saints departed, who are as they, enjoying the same blissful vision of God? To this may be returned:

That we are no more sure of the knowledge of angels in this particular, than we are of that of saints, and therefore the one ought to be proved, before the other be granted. The angels in heaven see indeed “the face of Christ’s Father which is in heaven;” but the meaning of that is not, that by enjoying the sight of God’s face, they therein see and hear all things transacted here on earth; but that they are God’s ministers, always attending round about his throne, and waiting before him to receive his commands, and to execute his pleasure.

But was this knowledge the privilege of the angelical nature,

* Ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων.



the equality which just men in the text are said to have to the angels, is not meant an equality of knowledge or perfection of nature, but a similitude of state and privileges ; and this appears from the context : “ In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God.” The just shall not be equal to the angels in every respect ; for as they differ in nature and kind, so they shall have distinct natural qualities and operations ; but in respect of bliss and happiness : they, as the angels in that spiritualized state, shall not need matrimony for the propagation of their kind, nor food for the preservation of their incorruptible bodies : they shall be free from all the necessities that attend temporal human life, and all the affections that arise from the body and sensitive part of man ; they as angels shall be the children of God, being children of the resurrection, partakers of the bliss, and immoveably possessed of all the privileges of the sons of God. Yet,

Was this equality to the angels to be meant of an equality in nature and knowledge, yet the saints departed are not to enjoy it until the resurrection ; and so, though the angels on that account might be invoked, yet the saints departed, who are not till the resurrection to have this excellent privilege conferred on them, are not till then to have this homage and worship paid to them : “ At the resurrection they shall be as the angels of God ;” whether they are before that admitted into the beatifical vision, we need not now dispute ; since, if they are, this angelical privilege of seeing all things in the face of God, is reserved for the saints, as a farther addition of bliss till that day.

Again, they produce Revel. v. 8. where it is said, that the “ four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.” By the prayers of saints, they mean, of those saints that are living upon the earth ; and by the four beasts and twenty-four elders, the saints that are in heaven, and from thence draw their argument, that saints in heaven do offer up the prayers of holy men living upon the earth.

And now if they are mistaken in the sense of this text, and by the four beasts and twenty-four elders are not meant the members of the Church triumphant, but the bishops and elders of the Church militant, whose office it is to present the prayers and praises of the Church to God, then this text cannot afford

them the least show of a reason for their invocation. Dr. Hammond, and many other learned expositors are of opinion, that either this whole text is nothing but a representation of the Church below, offering up prayers by their pastors, who are the mouths of the congregation to God through the Lamb (and it is said, ver. 10, that they shall "reign on the earth"); or else, a representation of the whole Church of Christ, both in heaven and earth, joining together in their doxologies and praises to God for the victories of the Lamb, and the redemption of the world by his blood; and for this sense, the next verse seems to give it, where they are said to "sing a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

Another place to be explained, which they sometimes mention as on their side, is Revel. vi. 10, where the souls of the martyrs under the altar, are said to cry, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth!" Now, say they, if the souls of martyrs pray for vengeance upon their persecutors and murderers: much more may we suppose them to pray for mercy and deliverance for their fellow-members and sufferers. To this may be replied:

That these words cannot signify a formal prayer of the martyrs to God for revenge on their persecutors; they who, after the Lord's example, prayed God to forgive their murderers when they were on earth, cannot be supposed, now they are in a more perfect state, to pray for vengeance upon them: but the words are only an emblem and representation of the certainty of God's judgments and vengeance overtaking them; by* "the souls of them that were slain" and cry under the altar, is meant their blood, and the sin of murdering them; and (as we are wont to say) murder is a crying sin; and as it is said that Abel's blood cried for vengeance, so the sin of shedding their blood cried, that is, would certainly awake and provoke the justice of God to take vengeance on them for it: this is well explained by a passage in the book of Esdras,† "Behold the innocent and righteous blood crieth unto me, and the souls of the just complain continually, and therefore, saith the Lord, I will surely avenge them," &c. But,

* Dr. Ham. [Annot. in loc. p. 891. Lond. 1675.] † Esdr. ii. 15.

Let their inference be granted, that the souls of martyrs, in the future state do pray for their fellow-sufferers that are left behind ; it does not follow that their fellow-sufferers shall pray to them, or that they offer up their prayers made to them unto God.

Lastly, They cite Gen. xlviii. 16, when Jacob, blessing the two sons of Joseph, thus prays, "The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads:" this will require no long answer.

God being pleased often to make use of the ministry of angels in sending succour and relief to good men, Jacob prayed not unto the angel, but to God, that he would appoint the same blessed angel, that administered unto him in all his straits, to be the instrument of his good providence to those two sons of Joseph, whom he had now made his own, and caused them to be called after his name. Or else,

If the patriarch must be thought here to have prayed to the Angel, we must suppose with Athanasius, and others of the Fathers, that Angel to be Christ the Son of God.

And the same answer is to be given to Revel. viii. 4, where it is said, that "the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God out of the angel's hand;" that is, Christ's, the Angel of the Covenant ; and therefore this Angel that offered up the prayers of the saints, is called, ver. 3, "another Angel;" intimating, that it was a special Angel, one different both in nature and office, from the other seven, mentioned ver. 2, and described there as ministering spirits: "And I saw the seven angels which stood before God," &c. ver. 2. And then, ver. 3, "And another angel came——" &c.

IV.

That there is no proof for it from the Fathers of the first three hundred years and more.

THE Trent Fathers,* and the Catechism put out their authority, having declared invocation of saints to be a custom received and continued in the Church ever since the Apostles' time, the Romish authors have not been wanting to turn every stone, to search every author, to produce and strain every sentence and expression that looks that way, to the height, in

* Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. Lut. Par. 1672.] Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. [p. 357. Mechlin. 1831.]

order to the making it good ; but how short their proofs fall of it, will be made evident by these following particulars.

1. Those that have taken the most pains to seek for testimonies, have not been able to produce any tolerable one out of the genuine writings of the Fathers, within the first three hundred years after Christ : they cite indeed the Hierarchy of Dionysius Areopagita, Origen's Comments on the second Chapter of Job, and the twenty-first of Numbers, the works of St. Ephræm, and Athanasius's of the most holy Mother of God ; but these have been sufficiently proved by many of our learned men,* and acknowledged by some of no obscure fame amongst them, to be spurious, and falsely fathered on them ; and then for their proofs out of Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Ambrose, it is easy to shew, that the first is grossly misunderstood, the second corrupted, and the third retracted by that Father.

Irenæus indeed is an ancient Father, and of sufficient authority ; but his words are little to their purpose ; they are these : † “ Sicut Eva seducta est ut effugeret Deum, sic Maria suasa est obedire Deo, ut Virginis Evæ virgo Maria fieret advocata : ” wherein the blessed Virgin Mary is termed the Advocate of Eve. Now to make this a pat proof for their invocation, they must put this sense upon it, that the blessed Virgin being a glorified saint in heaven, did, at the request and desire of Eve living upon earth, represent her case to God, and intercede with him on her behalf ; but how could Eve alive, request this of the Virgin Mary, when Eve died about three thousand years before Mary was born ! Or how could Irenæus ‡ think the blessed Virgin in a capacity to do this, whose opinion it was, with the generality of the Fathers in that age, that her soul, as all others of departed saints, were in an invisible place, and not admitted to the beatific vision ? Or, how could Eve stand in need of her advocateship, who, if it be true, as the Romanists § hold, that our Saviour at his resurrection freed the saints of the Old Testament from their *limbus*, and carried them up with him into heaven and the presence of God, was a glorified saint in heaven, whilst she was living upon the earth, and so was in a better state to be an advocate for the Virgin Mary, ||

* Mons. Dal. Coc. Censur. Patr. in D. Areop. Rivet. in Crit. Sac. Bellar. de Scrip. Eccl.

† Irenæus adv. Hær. l. 15. c. 10. [l. 5. c. 19.] [p. 316. Venet. 1734.]

‡ Iren. l. 5. c. 31. [Ibid. p. 330, 331.] § Aquin. Durand.

|| Bellar. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 19. [ut supra, p. 431.]

than the Virgin Mary for her? Thus you see, as clear a proof as Bellarmine thinks this to be, nothing can be more ridiculously and impertinently quoted; some other meaning then of the words must be found out, and the most obvious and natural is this, that the Virgin Mary is here, by a figure, put for Christ her Son, according to the flesh, and said to do that, as she was the happy mother of a son who did it; and thus indeed she is advocate for Eve, and all Eve's posterity, instrumentally, not by herself personally, but by her Son, she being that vessel made choice of by the Holy Ghost, to bear him in her womb, who by taking flesh of her, became the Saviour of Eve and all mankind.

For the testimony of Eusebius, it as Bellarmine reports it, runs thus: * "We honour those heavenly soldiers, as God's friends; we approach unto their monuments, and pray unto them as unto holy men, by whose intercession we profess to receive much help and assistance;" but it is apparent, as many learned men have shewn, that Bellarmine took this allegation not out of Eusebius's original, but a corrupt translation made by Trapezuntius, and afterwards followed by Dadræus, a doctor of Paris, who set forth Eusebius; there being no such words "as praying to them as unto holy men," to be found in him speaking his own language: his words are these; † ὁδὲν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θηκάς αὐτῶν ἔθος ἡμῖν παρίεναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς παρὰ ταυταῖς ποιῆσαι, &c. "It is our custom to come to their tombs and monuments, and to make our prayers," not αὐτοῖς, to them, to those martyrs, as the translator and Bellarmine would have it, but παρὰ ταυταῖς, i. e. θηκαῖς, "at or before their tombs and monuments, and to honour those blessed souls."

I might now pass over St. Ambrose, he living beyond the time I undertook to answer for, anno 374, but whatsoever he said of this nature, was said when he was but a young Christian, and recalled and contradicted by him afterwards: in his book of Widows, he exhorts them "to pray to the angels and martyrs, whom he calls beholders of our lives and actions:" ‡ but Baronius himself confesses (as Bishop Andrews proves it out of his life of St. Ambrose) that this book was written presently after his conversion, when he was but a raw divine, and had not thoroughly learned the Christian doctrine; and this appears by some other mistakes he was guilty of, besides

* Bellar. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 19. [Ibid.]

† Evang. Præp. l. 13. c. 7. [c. 11.] [p. 663. Colon. 1688]

‡ Speculatores vitæ actuumque nostrorum. [vol. 2. p. 200. Par. 1690.]

this, that are of as dangerous a nature; when in the same book he asserts, "that the martyrs either had no sin at all, or what they had, they did themselves wash away with their own blood."* But that St. Ambrose changed his opinion concerning this point of invocation, we are as sure as that once he held it, since we find him afterwards plainly asserting the contrary doctrine, in such words as these:† "That to procure God's favour, we need no advocate but a devout mind:" and again, speaking with relation to the two young sons of Theodosius, "Thou only, O Lord, art to be invocated, and prayed unto," namely, for a blessing and protection upon them.

2. They make the rhetorical flourishes and apostrophes of the Fathers in their panegyrics of the martyrs, to be solemn forms of invocation of them. The Fathers, about the latter end of the fourth century, observing piety and devotion to decay and wax cold, as the Church increased in riches and prosperity, thought themselves obliged, by all the wit, and art, and rhetoric they had, to retrieve, if it was possible, the pristine heat of devotion that was formerly in it; to that purpose they spake high and large in commendation of their martyrs, and sometimes in their orations directed their words to them, as though they had been there present; not with an intent to teach the people to pray unto them, or to rely upon their merits, but to signify the mighty favour they were in with God, and the more effectually to excite them to an imitation of their virtues: many such strains of rhetoric occur in the writings of St. Jerome, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and others. So St. Gregory Nyssen‡ speaks to Theodore the Martyr, in his oration, "Gather together the troops of thy brother martyrs, and thou with them beseech God to stay the invasion of the barbarians."

So St. Gregory Nazianzen,§ in his oration, calls unto St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Athanasius, to each after this manner, "Do thou favourably look upon us from on high."

After the same manner does St. Jerome conclude his funeral oration on Paula, "Farewell, O Paula, and help the old age of thy honourer with thy prayers." Now what is there in all this, but what is usual in all authors, both sacred and profane?

* *Proprio sanguine.* [Ibid.]

† Amb. in Rom. c. 1. tom. 5. Tu tamen, Domine, solus es invocandus. De obitu Theod. tom. 3. [Ibid. p. 1207.]

‡ Orat. in Sanct. Theod. [vol. 3. p. 586. Par. 1638.]

§ Orat. in Athan. [vol. 1. p. 286, 373, 397. Par. 1630.]

The design of the Fathers was, to raise the people to as high an opinion as they could, both of the persons of the martyrs, and their virtues that made them so illustrious; and might they not make use of their best art and rhetoric to do it? What is more in this than those apostrophes frequently found in the sacred writings, even to insensate creatures? "Hear ye, O mountains, the Lord's controversy! Praise the Lord, ye dragons and all deeps!" And who will infer from hence, that the insensate creatures were hereby invoked and addressed unto?

3. A great part of the testimonies they produce out of the Fathers, are to prove the intercession of saints in heaven for us, and not our invocating of them; and so they change the question, and are at a great deal of pains to prove that which nobody denies; such sayings as assert the saints praying for us, are frequent among the ancient Fathers, and that not only for the Church militant in general, but in particular for those whose persons and conditions were well known to them on earth; and these are cunningly shuffled in by the Romish doctors, as proofs of invocation for them, with a design to impose on the unwary vulgar who are supposed not to take notice of the difference (but it is a wonder if they should not, for it is wide enough) betwixt their praying for us, and our praying to them. Neither is this the only instance wherein those cunning sophisters play this game; first alter the nature of the question, and then where they have no adversary, to triumph in demonstrating the truth of it.

If the question be, whether the Bishop of Rome be the supreme head of the Church, and has an absolute jurisdiction and monarchy over all other bishops and Churches;* they shall bring you a number of testimonies out of both Greek and Latin Fathers, to prove St. Peter had a primacy of honour and authority.

If the question be, whether the bread and wine in the sacrament be substantially turned into the body and blood of Christ;† they will write a whole volume to prove the truth and reality of Christ's presence in it, which we own as well as they, but after a spiritual manner, not corporally, and by the way of transubstantiation.

If the question be about purgatory, a place prepared for the purification of those souls that depart hence not quite cleansed;‡

* Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 15, 16. [vol. 1. p. 359, &c. Prag. 1721.]

† Bellar. de Euchar. l. 2.

‡ St. Ambr. Hil. Orig. Hierom. &c.

they shall allege you Fathers, and those not a few, of unquestionable name, to prove the utter consumption of all things by fire, at the end of the world.

So here, when the question is, whether we ought to pray to saints departed; they bring innumerable Fathers to prove, that the saints departed do pray for us; hence we hear of that of St. Ignatius,* "My spirit salutes you, not only now, but will also when I enjoy God;" and of St. Chrysostom, in his oration to those that were to be baptized, "Remember me when that kingdom receives you."

4. They produce the sayings and practices of some few in the Church, for the general and allowed doctrine and practice of the whole Church. If the story should be true, that Justina, a Christian virgin, did in great distress jointly supplicate the blessed Virgin with God and Christ, does it follow that it was the practice of all to do so? It cannot be denied but that many of the Fathers let slip, in the heat of their affection and oration, many unwary speeches to this purpose, and that many, otherwise good men, were guilty of this excess of devotion to the martyrs: the many miracles God was pleased to work at the memorials of the martyrs, for the honour and confirmation of the faith, reasonably begat a custom amongst Christians to resort to those places, and there to offer their prayers to God; and thinking, it may be, they could not easily honour those too much, whom God was pleased, after so wonderful a manner, to declare his esteem of; from praying to God at their tombs, they began to pray to them themselves. But now,

We are to distinguish betwixt the speeches of some particular Fathers, and the general doctrine of the Church; betwixt what they express in rhetorical strains to move affection, and what they lay down in plain terms to inform the judgment; betwixt what comes from them in the heat of their discourses and popular orations, and what in cool and deliberate debates they set down for the truth of Christ: it is generally confessed that the Fathers oftentimes hyperbolize, particularly St. Chrysostom, and we must not take their flights of fancy for the doctrine of the Church.

We are to distinguish also betwixt what the Church did teach and allow, and what she only tolerated and was forced to bear with; the bishops and governors of the Church being

* Epist ad Tral. [p. 78. Lips. 1699.]

many times engaged with weightier matters, in defending the Christian cause against heathens and heretics, were not always at leisure to reform abuses and irregular practices, but were forced too often to connive at those faults which they had not time and opportunity to redress. St. Austin* complains much of this piece of superstition in his days, that it had got such a head, that the good Father wanted power to give a check to it :† “I can no way allow them,” says he, “and yet I dare not freely reprove them, lest I either offend some good men, or provoke some turbulent spirits.”

5. They cite the practice of the ancients praying to God, that for the intercession of those holy men that had died in the Lord, he would grant them their requests, as a good proof for direct praying to them : the ancients generally believing that the saints and martyrs, in the future state, did continually pray to God in behalf of the Church militant on earth, and some that their souls were present at their shrines and tombs, and did join their intercessions with those prayers of the Christians that were there offered up to God, were wont, in their addresses, to mention the martyrs, and to beg the effects of their intercessions, that God would be moved by their supplications as well as their own, to grant a supply of their wants and necessities : but this is no more praying to them than Moses may be said to pray to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, when he besought God to remember them in behalf of the people of Israel ; or than we may be said to pray for help to that part of the Church of Christ that is at a great distance from us, when we desire God to hear the prayers of his Church catholic dispersed throughout the whole world, in the behalf of all Christian people, that in all places call upon him. Thus it is said by the historian,‡ that the Emperor Theodosius, when Eugenius and his complices raised that dangerous rebellion against him, repaired with his clergy and laity to the oratories and chapels, and there lying prostrate before the tombs and monuments of the Apostles and martyrs, begged aid and succour by intercession of the saints.§ He did not pray to any saint or saints ; he did not beg help of them, but supposing they prayed with him and for him, he prayed unto

* St. Aust. de morib. Eccles. c. 31. tom. 1. [p. 710. Par. 1679.]

† Epist. 119. ad Janu. approbare non possum, liberius improbare non audeo.

‡ Ruffin. Hist. l. 2. c. 33. [p. 259. Basil. 1535.]

§ Sanctorum intercessione. [Ibid.]

God, that he would send him help for the sake of their intercessions in his behalf. This is also the meaning of those expressions of St. Austin,* that "they ought to commend themselves to the prayers of the martyrs, and frequent their tombs with a religious solemnity, that they may become partakers of their merits, and be helped by their prayers;" that is, not by praying to them, but (holding, as was then commonly believed, that when Christians came to their tombs, the blessed martyrs joined their supplications with them) by praying to God to afford them the benefit of their prayers, and that their petitions might succeed the better for the sake of their requests put up in conjunction with their own. The same account may be given of St. Basil's words,† in his oration on the Forty Martyrs: "He that is in distress flies to them, and he that is in prosperity runs to them; the one, that he may have his condition changed; the other, that he may have his continued:" but now to fly and to run unto them, signify no more than to fly and run to the churches and tombs where they lie interred, for so it follows; here a "woman praying for her son is heard; and here let us, together with those martyrs, pour forth our prayers;" supposing, it is likely, as was mentioned before, that the martyrs' souls were continually about their tombs, and prayed for all that came thither to pray for themselves, the Father exhorts Christians to go thither, not to pray to them, but to join with them in praying unto God.

6. They tell us of many miracles wrought by God upon addresses made to saints, and in this they triumph as an undeniable proof that God approves of such addresses: "God heareth not sinners, neither will he give his glory to another:" and therefore were prayers made to saints a sin of that sacrilegious nature, as to rob God of his honour: it is not to be thought that he would give such countenance to them against himself, as to crown them with success.

To this it may be answered: It is certain that at first God was pleased, upon the prayers of Christians put up to himself, to work many miracles for the confirmation of the faith; but that any were wrought in answer to such prayers that at those places were in after-ages made to the martyrs, is very uncertain and much to be suspected. St. Austin‡ names but two in-

* Aug. de Cur. pro Mort. c. 4. [ut supra, vol. 6. p. 519.]

† Basil. Hom. 20. in 40 Mart. [vol. 2. p. 218. Par. 1839.]

‡ August. de Civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 663, &c.]

stances of this kind that I have met withal, and at the same time he mentions them, he blasts their credit by telling us he had no undoubted authority for the truth of them : St. Chrysostom not only declares that miracles in his time were ceased, but hath wrote a discourse on purpose to give us the reasons why they were so : so that all the miracles the Church of Rome pretends to on this account, are either delusions of Satan, which God sometimes permits him to work for the trial of his people, or else cheats and impostures performed by cunning men of their own, to wheedle and impose on the easy and credulous vulgar.

V.

That there is full and evident proof in Scripture against it.

IF that general rule of St. Austin's* be allowed of, that "God is so to be worshipped," that is, as to all the essential parts of it, "as he has commanded himself to be worshipped," then all those places of Scripture that command us to direct our prayers only to God, and only in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, do with equal force forbid us to direct our prayers to any other object, or to use any other name and mediation. Now texts to this purpose are innumerable.

"O thou that hearest prayer unto thee shall all flesh come."†

"Call upon me in the day of trouble ; I will deliver thee."‡

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."§

"Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you."||

"In every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God."¶

"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally," — &c.**

"How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?"†† Now if none but God is to be believed in, none but God is to be called upon.

These are very plain and convincing, and no others need to be produced ; but because the Romish authors have been prac-

* Aug. de Consen. Evang. l. 1. c. 18. [Ibid. vol. 3. par. 2. p. 11.]

† Psalm lxxv. 2.

‡ Psalm l. 15.

§ Matth. xi. 28.

|| John xvi. 23.

¶ Phil. iv. 6.

** James i. 5.

†† Rom. x. 14.

tising upon some others, endeavouring to obscure and weaken their evidence, which are yet no less clear and full ; I shall bring them forth also, and not only wipe off the dust that has been cast upon them, but restore them to their own natural sense and perspicuity.

They are chiefly these four.

The first is, Luke xi. 2 : "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven——&c. for thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever." Now the meaning of this precept must be one or both these two things, either that we should use this form of words when we pray, or that we should compose all our prayers after this pattern ; take which we will, in either sense they oblige us to direct all our prayers to our "heavenly Father, whose is the kingdom, power, and glory." Whosoever we repeat this form of prayer we address to God as the object, saying, "Our Father ;" and if no prayer is to be made but after this pattern, then still it follows, that no other ought to be the object of it, but he who is "our heavenly Father." It is generally concluded on all sides, that in this absolute and perfect form of our Lord's Prayer is contained a summary of whatever ought to be the subject-matter of a Christian's prayer ; now since every petition in it is directed immediately to God our heavenly Father, it follows, that whenever we pray, we are not only to pray for no other things but these blessings, but also to beg them of no other being but him.

But to put by the force of the argument taken from this command of our Lord, "When ye pray, say ;" or "After this manner pray ye ;"* the Romanists tell us, that it is true, we are to imitate this prayer of Christ's in composing our own, as to its brevity and compendiousness, as to the subject-matter of it, as to the catholicness of its spirit, obliging us to pray for others at the same time when we pray for ourselves, saying, "Our Father ;" but not as to the object to whom our prayers are to be addressed ; for then by the same argument we may exclude the second and third Persons in the blessed Trinity, as well as angels and saints. To this it is no hard matter to give an answer. And,

1. It must be confessed, that the word *Father*, in this prayer, is to be meant chiefly, though not solely, of the first Person in the sacred Trinity ; he being the root and fountain of the

* Spenc. Script. mistaken by Protest. p. 57.

Deity, and the prime Original of all our happiness, may in special be called upon by us, so far as is consistent with our acknowledgment of the equal Divinity of the other two Persons; for though the Son and the Holy Ghost partake alike with him of the Divine nature, and consequently have a right to the same adoration; yet forasmuch as God the Father is the* first Person, and the Father who communicates that Divine nature to them both; forasmuch as God the Father hath that essence in himself, and what he is, is from none; but the Son and Holy Ghost have it by communication from the Father, and what they are, they are from him, this title may bear a particular and primary respect to him. Accordingly we find the Apostles in a particular manner directing their prayers to God the Father: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed ~~us~~,"† — "I cease not to make mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory,"‡ — "For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant you." — But,

2. The word *Father*, in this prayer, is to be taken essentially, and not personally, and so excludes not the other two Persons of the most holy and undivided Trinity, but only those that are of a different nature from them. Now if the whole three Persons are one in essence, then whenever we pray to, and do honour to God the Father, we must at the same time worship the other two, though not so directly, who are one with him. Thus our Saviour speaks, "I and the Father are one;"§ yea, the whole three Persons are so; as St. John tell us expressly, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost, and these three are one."|| We read that it was the will of God, "that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father;" and that we should honour the Holy Ghost as well as either, because we are equally baptized into his name: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."¶ Now if the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in essence with the Father, and to be honoured with the same honour, then, although in this title the Father be only expressly named and invoked, the other two Persons cannot but be implied and comprehended in it.

* John ii. 29. John vi. 27. John v. 26.

§ John x. 30.

|| 1 John v. 7.

† Eph. i. 3.

‡ Ver. 17.

¶ Matth. xxviii. 19.

3. We may consider that this doctrine of the Trinity being in a great measure a stranger to the Old Testament, and the Apostles, when our Saviour gave them this prayer, not sufficiently instructed in it, our Saviour might teach them to call upon God in such an expression, which, though for the present they might understand only of God the Father, yet afterwards when they should come more fully to understand and believe the Trinity, might fairly be extended to take in the other two Persons, Son and Holy Ghost.

4. Since it is by virtue of our spiritual relation to God by Christ, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, that in a more special and particular manner he is our Father; whenever we call upon God as a Father, and our Father, it implies that we address to him in the name and mediation of Christ, and by the assistance of the Holy Ghost. The Apostle tells believers, that they had received "the spirit of adoption, whereby they cried Abba Father."* St. Chrysostom's notion on the text is, that the Jews during the time of the Old Testament, being under a servile dispensation, did seldom or never presume to call upon God by that familiar appellation of a Father; but the Holy Ghost moving believers after a miraculous and extraordinary way, in the first days of Christianity, to invoke God by that name, as our Saviour had directed his disciples before, might well be called "the spirit of adoption," as thereby declaring them to be his adopted sons.

Another evident proof, are those words of the Apostle, 1 Tim. ii. 5: "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." The natural importance of the words seems to be this, that as there is but one God only, and no more, to whom we ought to pray, so there is but one Mediator only, and no more, by whom we have access with boldness to the throne of grace; one Mediator emphatically, in the same sense as there is one God; and you may as well make to yourselves more gods, as more mediators.

But to weaken the strength of this evidence, the Romanists distinguish betwixt a mediator of redemption and a mediator of intercession, and tell us, that the text is only to be understood of the former, which indeed is but one; but not of the latter, which may be more than one, even as many as there are angels and saints in heaven; but how little this distinction does serve their turn may appear by considering,

* Rom. viii. 15.

1. That there is a vast difference betwixt an intercessor and a mediator of intercession ; that saints in heaven, out of that charity that all the members of Christ have for one another, do in general intercede for the good of that body, of which they are a part, was owned and granted before ; but this makes them not mediators of intercession ; to which office it belongs to receive the prayers of others, and to present them to God ; and in order hereunto, they must hear the prayers of others, and receive information concerning their particular states and conditions, which they are not capable of.

2. That this text is especially to be understood of that part of Christ's mediatory office that consists in interceding for us ; the Apostle seems to oppose these words to the heathen form of praying, which was to many gods by many dæmons, who were reputed agents or mediators between their chief gods and them ; now all that the heathens attributed to their dæmons, was intercession only ; and the Apostle shews, that Christ being made a mediator every way effectual for that end, there could be no necessity of any mediators of intercession besides him ; so that the Apostle here replies two things to the heathen's multiplicity of mediators : 1. That God had appointed but one, the God-man Christ Jesus ; therefore he says, ver. 7, that he was "ordained a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity," for establishing the Christian faith and truth in this particular especially, of one God and one Mediator, in contradiction to the plurality of gods and mediators amongst the Gentiles. Answerable to this are those words of the Apostle in another place : * "Though there be that are called gods (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ." Here there is a manifest and direct opposition betwixt the heathen way of praying and the Christian ; the heathens had many gods and many lords mediators, the Christians but one God and one Lord mediator ; the heathens had many sovereign gods, betwixt whom and men they supposed there was no immediate intercourse : they had also many under-gods or dæmons, by whose agency and mediatorship they addressed themselves to their sovereign gods ; this the Apostle confutes, and shews that Christians are taught to believe and profess but one God, Maker of all things, to whom they ought to pray, and but one Lord, Mediator and Advocate, by whom they

* 1 Cor. viii. 5. [6.]

offer their petitions to him. 2. That there needed no other besides this one, he being a Mediator of redemption too, and on that account had not only an authority and commission from God to shew for that office, but an infinite worth and invaluable merits of his own to plead in behalf of mankind, and to procure the granting of their requests: he hath purchased what he begs for, and atoned for what he prays for; having no sin of his own to answer for, he was excellently qualified to intercede for pardon for our sins; and having perfectly fulfilled all righteousness, and shed his most precious blood for us, he highly merited of God, both for us and for himself; for us, the several blessing he intercedes for; for himself, the god-like honour and royalty to be the donor and dispenser of them: hence it is that the Apostle here makes his mediation to depend on his propitiation; and after he had told us there is but one Mediator, presently subjoins, “who gave himself a ransom for all :”* to the same purpose is that of St. John, “If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father;”† that is the same with a Mediator of intercession, and that we might be fully assured of the greatness of his authority and power, he adds, “Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins.”

A third scripture against saint-invocation are those words of our Saviour, Matth. iv. 10, taken out of Deut. vi. 13: “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” Now if prayer be a necessary and chief part of God’s worship, as all are agreed it is, we are bound by this scripture to pray only to God. But to this they say there are several degrees of religious worship, and that it is only an inferior kind wherewith they worship the saints departed, called by them *δουλεία*, when it is applied to ordinary saints, and *ὑπερδουλεία*, when to the blessed Virgin; and that they never worship them as they do God, with *λατρεία*, the highest kind of worship. If it be asked how does this appear, since the same signs and outward acts of worship are performed to the one as well as to the other? They answer that they have higher conceptions and intentions of honour to God in the exercise of their offices to him than when they perform the like to any angel or saint departed. To this several things may be said.

1. If these words, “him only shalt thou serve,” are to be

* 1 Cor. viii. 6. [1 Tim. ii. 6.]

† 1 John ii. 1, 2.

understood only of the highest of religious worship as a part of the whole, and distinguished from a lower kind, they had not been a sufficient answer to the devil's demand, he might thus have answered: I acknowledge the sovereign and almighty power of God as well as you, that it is he alone can command stones to become bread,* and the power I have over the kingdoms of the world, I own to have received from him, for it was delivered to me.† And therefore I do not desire that thou shouldest worship me as thou doest God, with λατρεία, with the highest degree of worship; but only with δουλεία, a lower kind; thy heart, the highest and most elevated thoughts and conceptions of thy mind may be given to God, it is only the outward act that I challenge of thee, that thou wouldest only "fall down and worship me," or by falling down worship me.

2. That the Scriptures often use these two words, λατρεία, and δουλεία, promiscuously to signify the same thing; and as sometimes λατρεία is set to signify that civil honour and service that is due to men in eminency and authority, so is δουλεία to express that religious worship that is only due to God. As to the first, God thus threatens the Israelites, "Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies;"‡ as to the other, many places may be instanced in. Thus when Samuel exhorted the house of Israel to prepare their hearts unto the Lord, "and to serve him only:"§ and when the Apostle urged Christians to be fervent in spirit, "serving the Lord,"|| and when our Saviour said, "ye cannot serve God and mammon,"¶ δουλεύειν is the word made use of.

3. That there is no such distinction in religious worship as an higher and lower kind, because whatever is religious worship, is such with respect to God only as the object, and therefore can be but one, and that in the highest degree, as God is one, and infinitely exalted above all. "Religion," say the Schoolmen, "is a moral virtue which exhibits due worship to God as the principle of all things." Lactantius** therefore derives it à religando, because it ties man to God; and St. Austin, à religendo, because men choose God again, whom

* [Matth. iv.] 3.

† Luke iv. 6.

‡ Deut. xxviii. 48. λατρεύσεις.

§ 1 Sam. vii. 3. δουλεύσατε.

|| Rom. [xii.] 11. δουλεύοντες.

¶ Matth. vi. 24. οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλεύειν.

** L. 4. Inst. c. 28. [vol. 1. p. 287. Wircebr. 1783.] de Ver. Rel. c. 55. [vol. 1. p. 787. Par. 1679.]

they had forsaken. It is not therefore whatsoever is excellent, but whatsoever is Divine, and as it is Divine, that is the object of religion. Now angels and holy men, although there be some kind of honour due to those excellencies that are found in them, an honour commensurate to those excellencies ; yet falling infinitely short of Divinity, must be excluded from having any share in that worship, which either by God himself, or the universal consent of mankind, is made religious, that is, appropriated to God. Neither,

4. Will it help the matter to say, that though the outward acts and expressions of worship to both are the same, there is a vast difference in the inward devotion of their minds and souls, and that when they pray to saints and angels, they must not be thought to do it with that height of affection, and trust and resignation, wherewith they call upon God. For, when all is done, words and outward acts will be reckoned to signify according to that sense and meaning custom and institution hath stamped upon them ; and let the inward thoughts of the votary be what they will, if he apply to saints and angels in such expressions and offices, or with such rites and ceremonies as, according to the usual acceptation of them, naturally import that hope and confidence, that love and duty that is due to God alone, he will be deemed to ascribe unto them the honour which he owes to God. Outward acts of worship are declarative of the inward respect and veneration of the soul to God, as words are of the inward thoughts and apprehensions of the mind ; and, as when I use such words which, according to common custom, signify such a proposition, I must be concluded to mean and intend that proposition ; so when I use such outward acts of worship, which by custom or institution signify the honour due to God, to any other, I must be thought to ascribe the honour that is due to God to that other. The Corinthians, although they knew that an idol was nothing in the world, yet because they observed the feasts that were dedicated to the honour of the idol, eating and drinking in the idol's temple, are said by the Apostle to drink the cup of devils, and to be partakers of the devil's tables, and to have fellowship with devils ;* that is, by doing those actions that in those places were used to signify the worship of the heathen gods, although they intended no religion, but civility and compliment in the compliance, they are said to worship those

* 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

heathen gods, who were not gods, but devils: The Israelites halted betwixt God and Baal, although they could not but have higher apprehensions of God than Baal. Yet by bowing the knee to Baal, and kissing his mouth,* by using those outward acts of worship, wherewith the heathens worshipped him, are said to be guilty of idolatry. In sum, was a mental reservation of keeping the heart to God, and intending the highest degrees of honour and worship to him sufficient to clear men from idolatry, whilst they perform outward acts instituted and customarily observed for religious worship to any besides God; the Israelites† could not be guilty of it when they sacrificed to the golden calf they had made; nor the wiser sort of heathens, who whilst they knew the vulgar gods to be no gods, but cheats and devils, did, out of fear of punishment, comply with the vulgar practice of burning incense to them; and the Primitive Fathers were very much mistaken who judged not only those Christians who at the Emperor's command sacrificed to idols against their consciences, guilty of idolatry, but even those who, though no threats could move them to do it in person, did yet either purchase‡ certificates that they had done it when they did it not, or procure some others, their heathen friends and servants, to do it for them, implicitly to be guilty of it.

I shall name but one Scripture more, Col. ii. 18: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels—and not holding the Head." Where we see the Apostle expressly condemns the worship of angels as forsaking of Christ, and not holding the Head; and if the worship of angels, it follows with greater force of reason, the worship of saints departed. What this worship was, Theodoret upon the place informs us where he says, "that the Jews," that is, Jewish Christians, "having received the law by the ministration of angels, and holding that the God of all was invisible and inaccessible, taught that men ought to obtain the favour of God by the means and intercession of angels." And the same Father tells us that "they had oratories and chapels of St. Michael."

This St. Paul calls not holding the Head, because they set up more mediators besides Christ, who was the only one appointed by God, and they that join others with him do forsake him; accordingly the Council of Laodicea condemned it

* 1 Kings xix. 18.

† Exod. xxxii. 8.

‡ Libellatici.

as idolatrous. The words of the Canon are these, "That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God and invoke angels, because they that do so forsake our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and give themselves to idolatry."* St. Paul and the Canon both speak so direct and home against the Romanists, that Baronius, it seems, was hard put to it to answer them when he is forced to beg Theodoret's pardon, and tells him, with his good leave, that he understood neither the one nor the other; that it was the religious worship of false and heathenish gods, not that of good angels, that was forbidden and condemned by both of them, and that those oratories of St. Michael were set up by Catholics and not by heretics, it being then the practice of the Church to invoke angels. And now, though we might safely venture Theodoret's judgment and credit against Baronius's, yet we have no need of his authority to find out the true meaning of the text; whoever considers that the Apostle condemns the worship of angels in general, and duly weighs the series of his discourse, will easily apprehend that it is not levelled against the heathens who had not yet embraced Christianity, but adhered to the worship of their false gods; but a sort of Judaizing Christians, who retaining still a mighty veneration for angels as the supposed givers of the law, endeavoured to introduce the worship of them into the Church of Christ: "Let no man beguile you of your reward—in worshipping of angels,—not holding the head." The Apostle's argument to dissuade them from that worship is, that by doing so they forsook Christ, which could not have been an argument to the heathens who had never yet believed on him.

VI.

That the Fathers of the first and purest ages, till after three hundred, are all express and positive in their writings against it.

How fully the sacred Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, do condemn the invocation of saints, you have seen already; now, that the Fathers of the purest ages understood the Scriptures in the same sense as Protestants do as to this particular, and are also very clear in their writings against it, will appear from these following considerations:

* Concil. Load. Can. 35. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 1503. Lut. Par. 1671.]

1. They generally denied the doctrine on which this of saint invocation is founded, *viz.* that saints departed do now reign in heaven, and enjoy the beatific vision. It is by this blessed privilege especially, of seeing God, that the Romanists ground their belief that the perfected spirits of just men in heaven come to see all things in him, to know the petitions, and to be acquainted with the requests of their humble supplicants; but now the primitive Fathers have peremptorily affirmed that the saints departed are not yet admitted to the sight of God, but are only kept in certain hidden receptacles, in the full enjoyment of peace and rest, till the general resurrection: this they have not only asserted in so many words, and endeavoured to prove, from our Saviour's* soul being in paradise, which they will not have to be the highest heaven; but thinking them in a condition not yet fully and completely happy, instead of invoking them, did pray for their further bliss and consummation.† So that denying the foundation, they cannot be supposed to grant the doctrine built upon it. No fewer than eighteen Fathers, by the Romanists' own confession, are of this opinion; and though they should be mistaken, as their great Cardinal thinks they were, and endeavours to prove; yet it is enough to our present purpose, that they did not hold the one, and therefore could neither teach nor practise the other.

2. One chief argument, which the primitive Fathers used to prove the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost against the Arians and Macedonians, was the catholic practice of the Church in praying to them: which would not have been of any force, had they believed that any creatures, though never so highly exalted in nature and condition, might have had that honour paid unto them. They tell us frequently in their‡ writings, that when the Gospel directs us to invoke the Son and Holy Ghost in conjunction with the Father, it proves them to be true God, that invocation supposing them every where to be present, when they are invoked, and that omnipresence being the sole property of God. For the same reason, when the Arians, who conceived Christ to be no more than an excellent and God-like creature, did yet pray unto

* Iren. l. 5. c. 31. [p. 330. Venet. 1734.]

† Chrysos. tom. 6. p. 998.

‡ Orig. l. 8. in Epis. ad Rom. c. 10. [vol. 4. p. 626. Par. 1759.]
Athan. Orat. 4. contr. Arianos.

him, the Catholics accused them of idolatry. Had the Catholics at the same time practised the invocation of saints, the charge might have been returned with greater force upon themselves, and whatever could have been thought of by the Catholics to excuse themselves from that guilt, might, with more strength, have been urged by the Arians in their behalf. Had the Catholics replied, as the Romanists do now, that though they did pray to the blessed spirits, yet they did not do it with that sovereign, direct, and final prayer, nor with those sublimest thoughts and intentions of honour, wherewith they did address to God, but only with indirect, subaltern, and relative prayer, and with no higher intentions of honour to them, than what is proportioned to the excellencies of their finite nature; the Arians might have returned upon them with great advantage: "Even after the same manner, sirs, and with the same due limitations do we invoke the man Christ Jesus; and whilst we do no more but so, we have more reason for what we do, than what you can have, since Christ is confessedly superior to all creatures, and consequently deserves at least as great an honour to be paid to him, as unto any the highest amongst them: though we do not think him God equal with the Father, yet the Scripture assures us 'he is exalted far above all angels, principalities, and powers, and every name which is named in heaven and earth;' and though we may not honour the Son in the same high degree, with an *as* of equality as we do the Father, yet the Scripture enjoins us to do it with the same kind of honour, with an *as* of similitude and likeness; and this is more than can be said in defence of that honour and invocation you offer to saints and angels."

3. Because the Fathers condemned the heathen as guilty of idolatry, for invoking their dæmons or inferior deities, which in a manner is the same with the Romish* invocation of angels and saints. This has been invincibly proved against the Romanists, by a great light of our Church, who hath made the parity and agreement betwixt them to be very obvious; as,

1. In the object of their invocation: the heathens had one supreme God, and a multitude of inferior deities; the Romanists have also, besides one God above all, a multitude of angels and saints departed. It may be, the vulgar and ordinary people might mistake for their gods, Jupiter of Crete, Mars, Venus, Vulcan, Bacchus, persons that had been famous

* Dean of St. Paul's against G.

for lewdness and adulteries; and if they did, it is to be feared not much better an account can be given of many of the canonized saints in the Church of Rome; but the wiser sort had far different apprehensions of their deities; they said and believed the same of the supreme God, as Christians do,* "that he made the whole world, and sees all things; that he wants neither power, nor will, nor knowledge to make his providence concerned in the least things;" that neither the actions nor the very thoughts of men's minds can be hid from him.

Accordingly we find St. Paul affirming of the heathens† "that they knew God," ascribing to the heathen's Jupiter, the being the Creator of all things; so he told the Athenians, "Him whom ye ignorantly worship, declare I unto you, God that made the world,"‡ and the being the Father of all mankind, when he said in the words of one of their poets, "for we are all his offspring." And then for their inferior deities, there is so very little disparity betwixt them and the angels and saints invoked by the Church of Rome, that it seems to be only in name. Accordingly St. Austin§ confessed, that the Platonists did affirm the same things of their good dæmons as Christians did of the blessed angels: did they distinguish their inferior deities into such spirits as were by death || delivered from the body, and such as never had any; into such as always lived in heaven, and such, whose merits had advanced them thither? How exactly does this suit with the difference given by Romanists betwixt angels and saints departed, and the reason of their worshipping them, the spiritual and heavenly nature of the one, and the merits of the other?

2. In the office ascribed to them. The employment the heathens put upon their dæmons was to carry up the prayers of men to God,¶ and what they had obtained to bring back to men; imagining the supreme God to be of too pure and sublime a nature, immediately to converse with men; they looked upon these as advocates and mediators betwixt God and men, and as intercessors and procurers of their desired

* Plot. Enn. 5. l. 9. c. 5. [p. 558. Basil. 1580.] Laert. in Vit. Thal. p. 24. Senec. Ep. 83.

† Rom. i. 21.

‡ Acts xvii. [23, 24.]

§ St. Aust. de Civit. Dei, l. 9. c. 23. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 235.]

|| Apul. de Deo Socr. p. 50. Cic. de Leg. l. 2.

¶ Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 8. c. 18. [ut supra, p. 206.]

blessings: and is not this the same thing the Church of Rome says, touching the office of angels and blessed spirits in the behalf of men, such as do solicit God for them, and by their more prevailing merits and interest in God, obtain of him what they themselves pray for?

3. In that which they make the foundation of their worship and invocation to them, *viz.* a middle sort of excellency betwixt God and men; so said the heathens, that there were a sort of beings between God and men, that participated of both natures, and that by means of those intermediate beings, an intercourse was maintained betwixt heaven and earth; and as God was to be worshipped for himself, so the others to be loved and honoured "for his sake, as being gods by way of participation, as likest to him, as his vicars, and as reconcilers betwixt them:" and is not this the declared reason why the Church of Rome gives religious worship to angels and departed saints, "because of a middle sort of worth and excellency that is in them, that is neither infinite as the Divine, nor so low as the human," but spiritual and supernatural? whereby approaching near to the Divinity they have great interest in the court of heaven, and ought, as Celsus said of their dæmons, to be prayed unto to be favourable and propitious to us. So exact you see is the parallel betwixt them. Now against this dæmon-worship the Fathers replied, that whatever great and supernatural excellencies were to be found in the spirits above, ought indeed to have an acknowledgment and honour paid to them both in mind and action, proportioned and commensurate to such excellencies; but yet they were not to be esteemed inwardly as gods, nor to be worshipped with any outward act of religious worship, be it erecting altars, making vows, or putting up prayers to them, as if they were such: for all and every part of that was solely due to God, and not to be given to any the highest created excellency; as you may see their minds more fully in the next particular.

4. The Fathers positively assert, that none but God ought to be invocated.

And the first I shall mention is, that advice which Ignatius* gave the virgins of his time, not to direct their prayers and supplications to any, but only to the blessed Trinity: "O ye virgins, have Christ alone before your eyes, and his Father in your prayers, being enlightened by the Spirit."

* Ign. Ep. ad Philadelph. [p. 227. Lips. 1699.]

Irenæus, in his first book, taking notice of some persons who had entertained strange fancies concerning the power of angels, and accordingly gave divine worship to them, tells us plainly,* that the doctrine and practice of the Church in his days was far otherwise, and “that throughout the world it did nothing by invocation of angels, nor by incantations, but purely and manifestly directs her prayers to God, who made all, and calls upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Feuardentius, in his notes upon the place, would have the words of the Father to be understood only of prayers made by evil men to evil spirits and angels; but then why did not the Father express it so? Why does he exclude all angels without distinction from divine worship; when he says, “the whole Church every where called only upon God and his Son Christ Jesus.”

Eusebius, in his history,† hath set down a long prayer of the holy martyr Polycarp, which he uttered at the time of his suffering; wherein there is not any one petition put up to saints, but every one directed to God through the mediation of Christ, closing his prayer with this doxology:‡ “Therefore in all things I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, through the eternal Priest Jesus Christ thy beloved Son; to whom, with thee, O Father, and the Holy Ghost, be all glory now and for ever.”

To which we may add, what also is recorded by the same author, that when the Church of Smyrna desired the body of their martyred bishop to give it an honourable interment, and was denied it by the governor, upon the unworthy suggestion of the Jews, that they would worship it, they thus replied, “We can never be induced to worship any other but Christ, him being the Son of God we adore, others, as martyrs and his sincere disciples, we worthily love and respect;” and that which here deserves a particular observation is, what the learned primate of Armagh hath pointed out to us, *viz.* that what in the original Greek is *σεβειν*, “religiously to worship,” is in the Latin edition,‡ that was wont to be read in all the Churches of the West, rendered *precem orationis impendere*, “to impart the supplication of prayer.”

* Iren. l. 2. c. 57. [c. 33. ut supra, p. 166.]

† Euseb. l. 4. c. 15. [p. 133. Par. 1659.]

‡ Ex passion. MS. 7 Kalend. Febr. in Bib. Eccl. Sarisb. et Dom. Rob. Cotton.

The next testimony I shall produce, is that of Origen, who is very full to this purpose: in his writings against Celsus, he tells us, "We must endeavour to please God alone, and labour to have him propitious to us, procuring his good-will with godliness and all kind of virtue; and if Celsus will have us to procure the good-will of any others after him that is God over all, let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the motion of the shadow thereof doth follow it; so in like manner, having God favourable to us, who is over all, it followeth, that we shall have all his friends, both angels and spirits, loving to us;" and whereas Celsus had said of the angels, that they belong to God, and in that respect were to be prayed unto, that they may be favourable to us, he thus sharply replies, "Away with Celsus's counsel, saying that we must pray to angels, for we must pray to him who is God over all, and we must pray to the Word of God, his only begotten Son, and the first-born of all creatures; and we must entreat him, that he, as High Priest, would present our prayer unto his God and our God." And when Celsus objected, that the Christians did not keep to their own rule of praying to, and worshipping none but God, since they gave the same honour to Christ, whom they knew to be a man, he replies, "that Christ was God as well as man, one with the Father," and proves it from miracles, and prophecies, and precepts, that this honour was given to him, to be worshipped as they worship the Father.

Had Celsus objected that the Christians worshipped angels and saints departed, it had been laid right, and would have borne hard upon them, and he had inferred strongly, that they might as well worship their inferior deities; but Celsus objects no such thing (but only their worshipping of Christ, which Origen was well provided to answer); and this is an evident proof that the Christians were not guilty of it. Had there been but the least ground to suspect them for it, it would have been so hugely serviceable to his cause, and with so much force have rebounded back upon the Christians, that it is not to be imagined so industrious and spiteful an adversary as Celsus, would have omitted, with the greatest insult and triumph, to have laid it at their door.

To these we might add the suffrages of many more, * who have written set treatises of prayer, teaching us to regulate all

* St. Cyprian.

our prayers after that most perfect pattern of our Lord's, and ever to direct our petitions to our heavenly Father only.

Gregory Nyssen saith,* "we are taught to worship and adore that nature only that is uncreated."

Athanasius, "that God only is to be worshipped, that the creature is not to adore the creature."

St. Austin† says expressly, "that the saints are to be honoured for imitation, not to be adored for religion; that at the communion table they were named, but not invocated. And again, you see the head of the most renowned empire stooping with his diadem, and praying at the sepulchre of Peter the fisherman, namely, it is to God himself that he prays, though at the tomb of Peter."

Epiphanius ‡ reproving, as he calls it, the women's heresy, who were wont to offer up ~~prayer~~ to the blessed Virgin, hath these words: "Let Mary be in honour, but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped:" and to shew us what a very ill opinion he had of that at least superstitious practice, he six times repeats in that tract, *Μαρία μὴ δεῖς προσκυνεῖν*, "Let no man adore Mary."

To name no more, Tertullian,§ in his Apology for the Christians, thus expresses himself; after he had set down the many great blessings the Christians thought themselves ever obliged to beg for their Emperors, "As long life, and valiant arms, and a faithful senate, and loyal subjects, and a peaceable reign; these things," saith he, "I may not pray for from any other but from him, of whom I know I shall obtain them, because both it is he who is alone able to give, and I am he to whom it appertains to obtain that which is requested, being his servant who observe him alone."

VII.

That the Doctrine and Practice of Saint-Invocation is impious and idolatrous.

THIS, I think, will be fully made out from these three particulars.

* *ἀκρίστον φύσει*, Cont. Eunom. tom. 2. Orat. 4. [p. 572. Par. 1638.] Orat. 3. Contr. Arian. [vol. 1. p. 204. Heidelb. 1601.]

† De Ver. Relig. c. 55. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 786.] de Civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 10. [Ibid. vol. 7. p. 673.] Ep. 42. [Ibid. vol. 2. p. 843.]

‡ Hæres. 79. adver. Collyridian. [p. 1064. Colon. 1682.]

§ Apol. Sect. 30. [p. 27. Par. 1695.]

1. This ascribes to angels and saints the attributes and perfections that are solely proper and peculiar to God, *viz.* his omniscience and omnipresence; for not only when mental prayers, as the Church of Rome directs, but (since the blessed spirits above cannot be supposed to espouse the cause of an insincere votary) when vocal prayers also are offered up to them, it supposes them privy to the very thoughts, and acquainted with the hearts of men; again, when innumerable prayers and supplications from millions of places at the greatest distance from one another, are at the same time immediately put up to them, it supposes in like manner, that they are present in all places, and at the same time can give audience to all their petitioners. Now what more or greater can be said of God? Is not this that infinite knowledge, that omnipresent power, and never absent nature that the Scriptures solely attribute to the Creator of all things, and have denied to any of the highest form of the creatures? And although I will not undertake to describe to you the exact bounds and measures of the angelical nature and perfections, how perspective their knowledge is! how piercing their understandings! how swift their motion! Yet sure I am, that neither they, nor any other the most elevated part of God's creation, can by their own natural power know the hearts of men, and be in all places at one instant of time. It is God alone, whose understanding is infinite, who looks down from heaven, and beholds all the ways of the sons of men: "He, even he knoweth all the hearts of the children of men."* "It is he that seeth in secret."† And God challenges it as peculiar to himself: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it? I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins."‡ By this argument the Fathers triumphed over the Arians and Macedonians, in proving the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, which yet would have been no argument at all, had not this knowledge been an incommunicable perfection in the Divine nature.

But it is said, that it is God indeed that only naturally, and of himself, knows the hearts of men, but this hinders not, but that others, his saints and angels, may know them by communication from him, *viz.* either by revelation from God, or by the beatific vision, "seeing all things in God, who sees all things."

* 1 Kings viii. [39.]

† Matth. vi. 4.

‡ Jerem. xvii. 9, 10.

In answer to this, not to mention how it contradicts the express words of Scripture, which without any distinction or limitation, does as plainly assert as words can do it, "That God only knows the heart;" not to mention the many disputes the Romanists have among themselves which way is to be chosen as the most probable, and after what manner, in either way, this knowledge is derived and passed from God to them: these things may be said,

1. That God hath nowhere declared, that he hath communicated this privilege and prerogative of his nature to saints and angels, or that he does any way make visible or known to them the hearts and the requests of men; and now, if what is not of faith is sin, we having no text of Scripture to build our faith upon in this particular, must of necessity sin in praying to them on that supposition, and commit that very sin too, which we doubt whether we so doing commit or no; nay, the silence of the Scripture in this particular, has in a manner determined the point; and we may conclude, that the most jealous God has reserved the honour of invocation to himself alone, since he has nowhere given us the least hint or intimation of leave to pray to them.

2. We are informed in Scripture, that the saints departed do not particularly know or mind what is done here below; God tells Josiah, "Thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see all the evil I will bring upon this place."* "The dead know not any thing,"† that is, of the affairs of this world, saith the Preacher. "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, and he perceiveth it not of them," says Job, of man in the other state. When Elijah was about to be taken up into heaven, he thus spake to Elisha, "Ask what I shall do for thee before I shall be taken away from thee:"‡ strongly implying, that when he was once gone, it was in vain to ask any thing of him. Elijah was immediately taken up into heaven, made no stay by the way, in limbo, as the Romanists themselves agree; being in heaven, his love to Elisha could not be forgot, nor his interest in God lessened, but rather both, by being exalted thither, very much increased and augmented; so that no reason can be given why he should limit and fix his making his desires known to him to the time of his abode with him on earth, but only this, his persuasion that in the

* 2 Chron. xxxiv. 28.

† Eccl. ix. 5.

‡ 2 Kings ii. 9.

other state he should not be capable to hear his request, and so all his future addresses to him would be ineffectual. To these we may add that known place in Isaiah, "Abraham doth not know us, and Israel is ignorant of us ;"* from whence St. Austin concludes, that "if those great men, and founders of their nation were ignorant of what was done in after ages to their posterity, why should the dead be thought in a condition to know or help their surviving friends in what they do."†

3. They that will have God acquaint particular saints and angels with those petitions that are put up to them, impose a very servile and dishonourable office on God ; and as sometimes they will have us, out of Discretion and humility, go to God by saints and angels, as men make their way to a prince by his favourites ; now they make the king and his subjects to change places, and God is sent to wait on them with the requests of their votaries. What can be more strangely ridiculous than this position of theirs ? That the petitioner must first make his suit to angels and saints, then God must tell those angels and saints both the person that prays, and the boon he prays for, then the angels or saints must back again and present them to God. Or, when any one addresses to an angel or saint, to supplicate the blessed Virgin in his behalf, God must first tell this angel or saint the contents of the address ; then he must post to the blessed Virgin ; she, upon the first notice of it, must have recourse to her Son ; and he, upon the motion of his mother, repair to his Father, to present that request to him, which he himself first revealed. But is not this an insufferable affront to God, and an intolerable abuse to themselves ? To send the Most High God on the errands of his creatures, and to apply themselves to broken cisterns, when they may directly go to the fountain itself of all blessings ?

4. Neither can the angels and spirits above know the hearts and petitions of their supplicants any more, by virtue of the sight of God, than by revelation from him. This fond opinion depends upon this Romish gingle, "That seeing God, they must in him see all things,"‡ that in idea are contained in him ; but does not the Scripture assure us, "That no one knows the things of God, but the Spirit of God which is in him ?"§

* Isa. lxiii. 16.

† St. Aust. de Cura pro Mort. c. 13. [ut supra, vol. 6. p. 525.]

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 11.

§ Eph. iii. 10.

Do they not tell us, how ignorant the angels were of the great mystery of man's redemption, notwithstanding their nearness to God, and beholding his face, "till it was made known to them by the Church."* Does not our Saviour let us know, that he himself as man, though his humanity was hypostatically united to the Divinity, did not pretend to know all the counsels and purposes of God? Speaking of the day of judgment, he says, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of heaven, but the Father only."† Why then should it be thought credible, that the blessed spirits above, by beholding God's face, do in that glass of the Divinity see all things and transactions that are done, and hear all prayers and petitions that are made by the sons of men?

2. This doctrine and practice is highly derogatory from the glory of God, as Governor of the world. God is the great Lord of heaven and earth; all that we are, and all that we have, we derive from him; we are upheld by his power, and maintained by his bounty and goodness: "In him we live, and move, and have our being;" "he gives to all life and breath, and all things:" he numbers the hairs of our head, paints the lilies of the field beyond the glory of Solomon, feeds the young ravens that call upon him; takes care of sparrows, much more of man, who is of a more worthy and excellent nature, much more yet of nations and kingdoms, who consist of multitudes of men linked by laws and government; and though sometimes, when he pleases, he makes use of the ministry of angels, and makes them the instruments of his providence towards the sons of men; yet he has nowhere told us, that he hath divided to them, much less to saints departed, their several provinces, or set them their particular tasks; that he has made them presidents over such countries or cities, patrons and guardians over such persons or professions; that he has given them a power over such and such maladies and diseases; but has reserved the power of dispensing his kindnesses, where, to whom, and in what measure, in his own hands; and therefore all our trust and confidence ought entirely to be placed in God, all our thanks and praises are due to him, and he alone is to be acknowledged as the author and donor of all our blessings: but now from that presidentship and protection, that power and patronage, that the Romanists‡ "intruding into those things they have not seen," without sufficient ground

* 1 Pet. i. 12.

† Matth. xxiv. 36.

‡ Col. ii. 18.

ascribe to angels and saints, over particular kingdoms, persons, and in particular cases and circumstances (though as substitutes under God), arises naturally some degree of trust and confidence in them, some debt of homage and praise to them; and it is well if the person obliged looks any higher in his returns of love and thankfulness, than to that particular angel or saint he prayed to, and from whose deputed power and authority he thinks he received his deliverance; and what is this but to rob God of the honour of being sole Governor of the world, and to make some of his creatures, who are no less beholding to him for their subsistence than the rest, to partake with him of that trust and affection, that homage and subjection, that is wholly due to him from all his creatures? What is this, as our Church in her Homily expresses it, "but a turning from the Creator to the creature?"* "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man," says the Prophet, and for the same reason in any finite and created being; because in what degree he does so, in the same does his heart depart from God; but "blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is."

What low and mean conceptions of God have those men, who think his government of the world must be modelled and conformed to a prince's government over his kingdom; and because he being but a man, and so not able in person to hear all complaints, and redress all grievances, appoints substitutes under him, judges and magistrates to do it; therefore God must do so too; whereas there is an infinitely wider distance between the wisdom, and knowledge, and goodness, and power of God, and those of the most accomplished governor, than there is between the height of heaven and the lowest centre of the earth: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."† The wisest monarch on earth falls infinitely short of the perfections of God; his knowledge is but short, his power small, and therefore cannot possibly, without the information and assistance of others, extend the influences of his government over all his subjects; did he not make use of more eyes and more hands than his own, the complaints of some would be altogether neglected, and the cause of others not rightly judged, his mistakes would

* Jerem. xvii. 5, 7.

† Isa. lv. 8, 9.

be innumerable, and his wings too short to cherish and foster, to shelter and cover every corner of his realm : but could he act with that plenitude of wisdom, and knowledge, and power, that is in God, all then might have access to his person, either immediately, or by his son, that is of like nature and power with him, and no man fear the being sent back unheard, or the having his cause misjudged, the not having justice done him, or mercy in a compassionate case withheld from him ; God's wisdom is never wearied with seeing, nor his power tired with acting in the world, supposing the affairs of the world to be infinite, which they are not, yet God is infinite too ; and now an infinite God can with as much ease manage and govern an infinite number of affairs, as one wise man can prudently manage one affair, infinite bearing the same proportion to infinite, as one does to one. —

The same fancy likewise of making the court of heaven resemble princes' courts on earth, hath brought forth that excuse in the Romish supplicants, that it is out of an humble sense of their own unworthiness, and an awful regard to the infinite Majesty of God, that they address to him, as earthly subjects to their king, not immediately to himself, but by the mediation of angels and saints, those courtiers and favourites of heaven. But what wise man on earth, who is abundantly satisfied of the readiness and ability of his prince to help him, and hath free leave given him on any occasion to come, immediately, or by his son, to him, will choose to waive this freedom of access, and apply himself to some inferior officer and favourite (of whose power and interest he is not so well assured), either to relieve him himself, or to procure relief of the king for him ? This is our case ; God is of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power, every way able, on all occasions, to afford suitable aids and supplies to the wants of his creatures, hath not only allowed, but commanded all “ to call upon him in the day of trouble, to pour out their complaints to him,” hath over and over promised “ to hear their prayers, and to answer them,” hath appointed his own Son, God with himself, the master of requests, from time to time to receive all the petitions of his subjects ; and both the one and the other are infinitely more able, and infinitely more willing to hear and succour them, than the best and wisest, and most powerful of all created beings ; and shall we now be afraid to take the liberty that God hath given us ? Shall we call that impudence which God hath made our duty ? Whilst we pretend humi-

lity, shall we forfeit our allegiance, and distrust his promises, and suspect the goodness of his nature, for fear of being too saucy and too bold with his person? To this pretence of voluntary humility, the Fathers long since, particularly St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom, gave a satisfactory answer; St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of those Commentaries that go under his name,* observing that the heathens used the same apology for going to their gods by their inferior deities as the Romanists do now for their addressing to God by saints and angels, namely, "as men go to the king by his courtiers, out of humility and a deep sense of the infinite distance between God and them," calls it "a miserable excuse;" and adds, "is any man so mad and regardless of himself, to give the honour due to the king to any of his courtiers; which, if a man does, he is condemned of treason? And yet they think themselves not guilty, who give the honour due to God's name to a creature, and forsaking God, adore their fellow-servants, as though anything greater than that were reserved for God himself. But therefore we go to a king by his officers and servants, because the king is but a man, who knows not of himself whom to employ in his public affairs (without information from others). But with God it is otherwise, for nothing is hid from him; he knows the deserts of every one, and therefore we need no spokesman but a devout mind; for whosoever such an one shall speak to him he will answer him." St. Chrysostom also, often to the same purpose, denies the way of our coming to God to be like the manner of kings' courts: "When thou hast need,"† saith he, "to sue unto a king, thou art forced first to apply to his favourites, and go a great way about; but with God there is no such thing; he is entreated without an intercessor; it sufficeth only, that thou cry in thine heart, and bring tears with thee, and entering in straightway thou mayest draw him unto thee:" and for example hereof, he sets before us the woman of Canaan: "she entreated not James, she beseeched not John, neither did she go to Peter, but broke through the crowd to Christ himself, saying, I have no need of a mediator, but taking repentance with me to recommend me, I come to the fountain itself; for this cause did he descend; for this cause did he take flesh, that I might

* 1 [In] Rom. i. 21. [vol. 2. Append. p. 33. Par. 1690.]

† St. Chry. Sermon. 7. of Repentance. [ut supra, vol. 2 p. 336.] Sermon. in Psalm iv. p. 524, 802. [Ibid. vol. 5. p. 8, 9.]

have the boldness to speak unto him ; I have no need of a mediator, have thou mercy upon me."

3. It is highly injurious to the honour of Christ, as the only mediator God has appointed betwixt God and man. God, as the reward of the unspotted innocency of his life and perfect obedience of his death, exalted him to the right hand of majesty and glory, bestowed a mediatorial kingdom on him, invested him with all power in heaven and earth, and gave him authority to receive and answer the prayers of his people: "Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree, him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour:"* "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."† "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross ; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name ; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."‡ So that now to make more mediators than Christ, is not only to undervalue his all-sufficient merits, to distrust his never-failing interest and power with God, but also to invade that honour and royalty that God hath conferred on him alone ; by giving to angels and saints the same power, they give them the same honour too, and Christ is robbed of both, whilst others are made to divide with him. But to which of the angels or saints departed, said God at any time, "Sit thou on my right hand to make intercession for men?" Of which of them has he at any time affirmed, as he has done of Christ, "He is able to save them to the uttermost, that come to God by him, seeing he ever lives to make intercession for men? That if any man sin, he is an advocate with the Father for him? Or, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in his name, it shall be given you?" Certainly, they who will have angels and saints mediators betwixt God and men, ought to produce a commission signed by God, or his Son Jesus, to constitute them such ; but this they are no more able to do than they are to make a grant of such power and honour themselves to them. It is true, the blessed spirits above are said to stand about the throne of God, and the holy angels to behold his face ; and as the honour of a prince is increased by the number of his attendants, so is our Lord's exaltation rendered the

* Acts [v. 30, 31.] † Acts [ii. 23, 36.] ‡ Phil. ii. [8, 9, 10, 11.]

more glorious by those ten thousand times ten thousand that minister unto him; but yet it is never said, "they sit at God's right hand, or live for ever to make intercession for us;" and having no such delegation of power from God for this office, the honour and worship that belongs to it cannot be given to them without manifest wrong and sacrilege to Christ, who has. The holy angels are God's ministering spirits, and the spirits of just men departed his glorified saints; but God hath made "Jesus only Lord and Christ: and put all things, in heaven and earth, in subjection under his feet;" of him only hath he said, "Let all the angels honour him, and let all the saints fall down before him, and all men honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."* Amen.

TO CONCLUDE:

Were we certain that the saints departed do now reign in heaven, and enjoy the beatific vision; and that it was lawful to invoke such as are undoubtedly saints, as the blessed Virgin and the holy Apostles: yet, methinks, a wary man should be shy, and not over-forward to exhibit that honour to all whom the Pope hath canonized: I cannot for my heart but think, that the prelates and bishops in King Henry VIIIth's time had as much reason to unsaint Thomas à Becket for being a rebel against his Prince, as Pope Alexander III. had to canonize him for being a bigot for the Church. What can a sober Christian think of the saintship of some, who never had any being in the world, and of others who never had any goodness; many of their saints are mere names, without persons; and many mere persons, without holiness; nay, I am very confident, that the greatest incendiaries and disturbers of the peace of the world do as well deserve it, as that famous Pope Hildebrand, or Gregory VII. Innumerable might be instanced in, whose saintship justly falls under great suspicion; but it is enough that some Romanists themselves, and those of no little authority in their Church, have granted† "that the Pope's canonizations are doubtful and subject to error:" if then at any time his infallibility should chance to mistake, as I am pretty sure he has more than once done, the members of that Church are in a sweet case, and are not only in danger of invoking saints, but devils also; which is idolatry with a witness, and by their own confession.

* John v. 23.

† Bellarm. de Beat. Sanct. l. 1. c. 7, 8. [vol. 2. p. 396, &c. Prag. 1721.]

A DISCOURSE

CONCERNING THE

WORSHIP OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND THE SAINTS :

*An Account of the beginnings and rise of it amongst Christians,
in Answer to M. de Meaux's Appeal to the Fourth Age,
in his Exposition and Pastoral Letter.*

§ 1. THE gentlemen of the Church of Rome have been pleased lately to send books amongst us of a very different strain: on the one side "Popery Misrepresented and Represented," but especially Monsieur de Meaux's "Exposition of the Roman Doctrine;" on the other side our Lady's "Rosary," and the "Contemplation of her Life and Glory," &c. which go up and down, though not so openly as the other. And we believe they have books in readiness to explain over again their meaning in the other articles (treated of in the "Exposition"), at the same rate that their books of particular devotion to our Lady, do explain the articles of religious worship, and Invocation of Saints.

In the mean time they seem to believe, that there are no articles will bear a representation in their true colours, sooner or better than these. And the truth is, as mankind has in all ages been very prone to superstition, so to no kind of it more than to that of worshipping dead men and women; which being the practice they would reconcile us to, in the first place, we are concerned the more thoroughly to examine, what they now think fit to say for it.

But let no man think, that in this cause we are engaged against the saints departed, because we contend with their worshippers. Let no man take our refusal to honour them, as their worshippers honour them, for an argument that we do not honour them at all. We are content to be tried by that known rule of St. Austin, that "they are to be honoured for imitation, not to be adored for religion." We believe that the highest honour we can do them, is to follow their examples:

we love their memories ; we celebrate anniversary commemorations of their piety and virtues, especially of their sufferings for righteousness' sake ; we congratulate their victories over the world ; we rejoice in their glory and happiness ; we propound their examples to the imitation of the faithful, exciting them to live as the saints once lived, that they at length may inherit those promises, which, by their faith and patience in this world, the saints now inherit in the other ; we praise God for them, as often as we meet together at the holy table of our Lord : and when we meet to inter our Christian brethren, we pray to God "to hasten his kingdom, that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of his holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in his everlasting glory."

Thus we honour the departed saints, remembering all along, that though they are highly exalted above us, who are here below imprisoned in earthly bodies, and struggling in a sinful world with infirmities and temptations ; we yet belong to the same body, of which they are members, and that they are still our fellow-servants. We are persuaded they have not less, but rather more charity for us than they had for the Church, when they lived upon the earth ; but whether they know us in particular or not, or in what instances they express their charity towards us, God having made no revelations of these things, we can define nothing about them ; and therefore we dare not give them those honours, which suppose such an assurance of these things, as God hath thought fit to deny us.

As the Virgin Mary in particular, we do with men and angels acknowledge that she was "blessed amongst women," since she brought forth the Saviour of mankind, and the Lord of heaven and earth ; since she was not the mother only, but the virgin mother also of our Lord, and conceived him by the power of the Holy Ghost. Which confession so honourable to her, being inseparable from a right belief concerning our Lord Jesus, we do not only set it forth upon the anniversary of the Annunciation, but frequently also in our sermons, and daily in the Creed. Moreover, we take these singular graces of God towards her, in conjunction with other things of a more common quality : we doubt not but she was an excellently pious and virtuous person. We see by her behaviour, when the angel Gabriel* came to her, that she was not apt to be

* Luke i.

imposed upon by counterfeit visions and revelations, nor forward to believe great things of herself, nor lifted up with pride, because she was so highly favoured; but that upon this extraordinary occasion, she wholly resigned herself to the disposal of God, with a wisdom and humility that could not but be habitual. But if nothing at all had been said of her personal qualities in the Scriptures (as indeed there is but very little), we might have presumed without rashness, that because God (who has no less regard to a holy mind than to a pure body) would have the mother of our Lord to retain the purity of a virgin, he would also choose a most holy virgin to be his mother: and since he was pleased to send us so heavenly a treasure in an earthen vessel, he would choose one of the greatest honour. For which reason likewise, we might have concluded, without other testimony, that she became afterwards a faithful disciple of her Son. For when one, in admiration of him; cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps that gave thee suck: Yea rather," said he, "blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it:" without which blessedness, she that bore him in her womb, and nourished him at her breasts, would have been justly esteemed by all generations, the most unhappy and miserable creature in the world. Finally, from all this we cannot but conclude that she is very happy and glorious in the kingdom of heaven. For though we have no particular revelations concerning this, to warrant any comparisons of her state, with that of angels and archangels; yet, upon general reasons we may say with sufficient assurance, that her rewards and glories in heaven are exceeding great, and such as hold proportion, not only with her faith and patience (for as some think she suffered martyrdom); but likewise with that honour, which God was pleased to confer upon her in this world.

Now if anything remains, whereby to express the tenderness we have for the honour of the blessed Virgin, it is this, That we should do what we can to redeem her name from that dishonourable imputation of affecting glories that cannot belong to the most excellent creature, that is but a creature: for they who, by most solemn rites of religious service, address to her, as to the "queen of heaven and earth," would make us believe, and pretend to believe themselves, that she is pleased with that worship which they offer to her. But if, as we say, they yield to her those services which no creature is to receive; they do by consequence represent her as a lady, that aspires to the

glory of the Most High ; which is by no means for the glory of the blessed Virgin. And if their saint-worship be liable to the same charge, thus also they represent the other saints. Now though in opposing their doctrine and practice, we are principally moved by that concern we ought to have for the glory of our Creator and Saviour ; yet it is some inducement to us so to do, that we shall thereby vindicate the blessed Virgin also, and all the glorified saints. For if she knows what passes amongst mortals, she cannot but be displeased at those services that have been, and still are paid to her, by some of her Son's disciples ; and if she said any thing at all to them, she should say to her votaries, but with greater indignation, what the angel said to St. John, falling at his feet to worship him ;* " See thou do it not : I am thy fellow-servant : worship God."

The same I say of the angels, the apostles, the martyrs, and all the saints, whom they honour with the same kind of worship that they give to the blessed Virgin. Only the degree of her worship, and the frequency of their addresses to her, and the strength of their confidence in her, is so much greater, that they have thought fit to invent a word of art to express it by : *Hyperdulia* they call it ; a word which our people cannot understand better, than by knowing the practice which it is a name for.

It is so vast a proportion of religious service, which they render to her ; it consists of so many parts and diversities, that it were a labour to recount them as particularly as the case would bear. It shall suffice to mention some of the principal heads. They worship her with religious prayers and vows. They erect churches and oratories for her service ; where they worship her very images and pictures, and pretended relics. They make rosaries and compose Hours, Psalters, and other forms of devotion to her : they ask things of her that are proper to be asked of God only : they burn incense to her images,* and offer their very sacrifice of the mass in her honour.

Now as to this, and all the rest, we cannot but stand amazed, that this service of the blessed Virgin should grow to be one of the principal parts of their religion ; when the holy Scriptures have not given us the least intimation of rule or example for it, or of any doctrine or practice that leads to

* Rev. xix. 10.

it. That it should be a main design of their catechisms to instruct youth in the worship of the blessed Virgin; of their sermons to excite the people to put confidence in her, and to call upon her for the present occasion; of their books of devotion to direct them how to pray to her, and magnify her in formal invocations; of their confessors to enjoin penitents to say so many Ave Marias, in satisfaction for their sins, and to make at least as frequent applications to Mary, as to Jesus himself, for deliverance from sins and dangers: when not one word, not one intimation of any thing like to any thing of all this, is left upon record in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles; from whom those men pretend to derive their religion, whose books are large enough for this so famous a service, to have been at least mentioned somewhere or other; and who, without all doubt, would have more than mentioned it, if it had been the religion of those times. This is that we must always wonder at, and so much the more, because the constant tenor of the holy Scriptures bears against such practices as these, agreeably to that precept of both Testaments, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

And indeed our reasons to keep at a distance from this worship of the blessed Virgin and the saints, are so obvious and commonly known, that I shall not make it a business by itself to represent them. But these two things I shall consider as well as I can:

1. The plausible expositions and colours, by which they have tried of late to justify themselves in these things.

2. What were the beginnings of this kind of worship amongst Christians, and by what steps it is grown to that height, in which we now see it. I shall consider the former in a narrow compass, because much has been said to it already. The latter is what I chiefly design.

§. 2. In pursuance of the first thing propounded, I shall particularly observe how Monsieur de Meaux hath expounded these matters, under the heads of religious worship, of invocation of saints, and giving honour to images and relics: but I shall begin with the two latter, because he expounds these particularly; and then I shall consider the general defence he makes, for all the religious worship they give to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints.

The worship of invocation is the foundation of a great many

other things done in her service : for instance, it is this that hath brought forth the Rosary, the Psalters, the Hours, and all other offices of devotion to her. It is this that hath raised her shrines, and built oratories and chapels for her especial service. And indeed, if she as well as God is to be worshipped with prayers and hymns, it is but reasonable, that she should have her holy places for such services, as well as God. And yet St. Austin* thought the erecting of temples to be so proper an act of divine worship, that if we should do it to the most excellent angel, we should be anathematized from the Church of God : whereas therefore our churches are known from one another in cities and populous towns, by the names of several saints ; yet we profess, that however for distinction sake they are so called, they are God's houses and oratories, and not theirs ; and it is most manifest that they are used by us for his worship, and not for theirs in whole or in part.

The invocation of the blessed Virgin and the saints has run out into some excesses, from which they might have separated it ; and therefore to these excesses I shall say, but little, especially because they defend them very faintly, and with great appearances of self-condemnation.

It was too much in all reason, that the Council of Trent† allowed of mental as well as vocal prayers to be made to the saints ; for this ascribes to them the knowledge of the secrets of hearts. And it is a very faint plea for this, which Monsieur de Meaux‡ makes in saying, that “ God did not disdain to discover future things to the prophets, though they appear much more particularly reserved to his own knowledge.” For this does not clear mental praying to the saints, from the consequence we charge it with, unless they were sure, that as God discovered some future things to the prophets, so he does also perpetually reveal the prayers of our mind to the saints. The instance shews what is needless, that God can do it if he please ; it does not shew that he does it, and that only would have been to the purpose.

Besides, whatever opinion they have of the lawfulness and profitableness of praying to saints, they should have been very much afraid to affirm them to be mediators of intercession ; when, without any distinction, the Scripture does not only

* Cont. Maxim. Arian. lib. 1. c. 11. [vol. 8. p. 686. Par. 1688.]

† Sess. 25. de Invoc. S. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 395. Lut. Par. 1672.] Bellar. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 20. [ut supra, p. 419.]

‡ Exp. p. 8. [p. 7. Lond. 1686.]

give to Christ the quality of a mediator, as M. de Meaux* grants; but likewise the quality of our only Mediator, as he should have granted. For as "there is one God," so "there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."† Much less should men have been encouraged to make immediate applications to the saints, more frequently than to God or to Christ; as if the saints were more easily prevailed with by our prayers, than our God and Saviour. These excesses were too notorious to be denied, but withal, they were too scandalous to be confessed; but in all reason they ought to have been severely reproved. M. de Meaux would have us to observe that the Council teaches, it is good and profitable to pray to the saints. And we do observe, that though the Fathers were not insensible of the extravagant practices and doctrines in this matter, that were current amongst them, yet they would not vouchsafe to note them with the least censure; but were content to let them go on, as they had done before.

Moreover they pray to the blessed Virgin, to protect them from the enemy, to receive them at the hour of death, to be propitious to them, to spare them, to give them strength, to give them grace, to open the gate of everlasting life to them, and for all that a good Christian can ask of God. Such like prayers do they also offer to the other saints: but neither shall I stay upon this; because they do not go about to justify it amongst us, otherwise than by pretending, that they say what they do not mean; and that "the intention of the Church, and of her faithful, reduces these prayers always to this form, that the saints would pray for us."‡ Now when they confess, that "the outward veneration is established to testify the inward sentiments of the mind,"§ we desire no greater evidence of self-condemnation in this case, than to hear them say quite backward, that the intention of the Church and her faithful is established to explain the meaning of so considerable a part of their outward worship. But in the mean time, God help the common people, if they are to be judged after their own intentions and understandings, and not the intentions and expositions of some few guides of their Church.

To name no more of these enormities; their dividing to the saints their several offices in their prayers to them, is a most unaccountable superstition, *i. e.* that one saint is applied to

* Exp. p. 6. [Ibid. p. 5.]

† Exp. p. 6. [Ibid. p. 5.]

‡ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

§ P. 9. [Ibid. p. 8.]

for the cure of one disease, and another for another ; and some peculiar things desired of almost every one. For how can they persuade us, that they desire nothing of the saints but the help of their prayers, when they attribute to each saint his particular virtue and power ; unless they think that St. Apollonia's intercession is not as effectual against the gout, as the toothache ?

§. 3. But setting aside these excesses, which several moderate men of their own Church have complained of, but all to no purpose . let us hear what they say in behalf of praying to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints at all, supposing it be for nothing but to pray for them, as one creature may do for another ; and that they speak to her and them in hymns and strains, which, as to the matter therein contained, do not exalt them above the condition of creatures : in one word, why they address to her, and the rest of the saints, with any sort of formal invocation.

We dare not do this, because we believe prayer to be an essential part of God's worship, inasmuch as it is sometimes put for the whole : "How shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed ;" *i. e.* "How shall they serve and worship him ?" It is so incommunicable a worship, that God himself described his own house by it : "My house shall be called an house of prayer." And surely when God named his house by some part of that service that was performed there, he would choose such a part as was peculiar to himself. This and much more we say for ourselves.

But to all that we can say, they give this plausible answer, That it makes no more against their practice, in desiring the prayers of their brethren in heaven, than against theirs and ours,* in desiring the prayers of our brethren upon earth ; and as Monsieur de M. says, that it "is profitable to pray to the saints, in the same spirit of charity, and according to the same order of fraternal society, which moves us to demand assistance of our brethren living upon earth"†

Now this is a very popular way to save themselves from blame, but by no means sufficient : for there is a concurrence

* "What have they to say to this prayer ? Pray for us. Is it not word for word St. Paul's ? Is it more injurious to the Creator, because in the same spirit we address to the saints that live with him ?" *Past. Let.* p. 16. [*Lond.* 1686.]

† *Exp.* p. 6. [ut *supra.* p. 5.]

of other reasons to make it profitable to desire the prayers of our brethren upon earth, besides these two, that "they are our brethren," and that "we love one another." God has manifestly approved it in the holy Scriptures; that is one reason: besides, we are also sure, that when we desire our brethren upon earth to pray for us, they hear us: that is another reason. But neither of these reasons can be justly produced, to shew the profitableness of praying to the saints departed.

But because this is the most common and colourable defence they make, I shall further shew, what may and ought to be replied to it by the people of our communion. They say, we may as lawfully desire those in heaven to pray for us, as those on earth. But let us then tell them, that when we ask of one another things proper to be asked, these requests are by no means that which we understand by "prayer or religious invocation;" and that themselves do not so account them. Monsieur de M. clearly gives them another name; he calls it, "beseeching or demanding the assistance of our brethren."* But men of all religions do agree, this is to be a quite different thing from that part of religion which we call prayer.

And to make this matter so plain, that it can neither be misunderstood nor denied; suppose a man visited with a pestilence, or any other dangerous distemper, do desire his physician to apply his best skill to recover him: Is this prayer or religious invocation? No; they will not say it is. But if the same person desires the blessed Virgin, or St. Roche, or St. Sebastian, to restore him to health; this they will confess to be prayer. And the reason of the difference is not, that the physician is desired to help the patient by his skill in natural remedies, and the saints by their intercession with God. For suppose that the patient sends for the priest, and desires him to pray for him, they will not say this desire is a prayer to the priest, or a religious invocation of him: they will tell you, that the sick man desires or demands the assistance of the priest's prayers. But still, if he calls upon the blessed Virgin, or any of the saints departed, to help him by their prayers: this is properly, and in the account of religion, praying to them. What then is the reason of the difference? for here is a request made to the priest and to the saint, and the same request too. Why is one prayer, and the other not? Now though we should not perfectly agree with our adversaries

* P. 6, 7. [Ibid. p. 5, 6.]

about the reason of the difference ; yet so long as it is and must be acknowledged, that the honest requests we make to one another upon earth, are not that part of religion which we call prayer ; but that the requests, which we make to the departed saints, are prayer : so long, I say, as this is granted, it is plain, that this their common argument, " It is lawful and profitable to desire the assistance of our brethren's prayers here upon earth ; and therefore it is lawful and profitable to call upon those in heaven, to assist us with their prayers," is very deceitful. For this is as much as to say : Those requests which are not prayer, may be lawfully made to creatures ; and therefore those which are prayer may be made to creatures, as lawfully as those that are not.

Now if you desire to know, what it is in this case that makes the difference, I think the answer is very plain. For the difference is not to be taken, 1. From the matter of the request, for that is the same : nor, 2. From the persons themselves {to whom the request is made ; for if the saint departed were here, why would my requesting of the same thing be prayer to him, and not to the saint ? and therefore, 3. It must necessarily lie in the different circumstances of the priest and the saint ; that the former is with me, and the latter is absent from me. Requests made to the faithful, are made to those that are within the compass of civil conversation. But the same requests made to the blessed Virgin and the saints, are made to those that are departed out of the compass of civil conversation. And this is that which makes them not to be prayer in the former case, and to be prayer in the latter.

But if it be further inquired, why it is prayer to ask the same things of those that are distant from civil conversation, which, to ask of those that are within the compass of it, is not prayer ? The reason seems plainly to be this, that when I address myself to one that is within the compass of civil conversation, in which men use to hear or to understand one another ; my assurance that he hears me, does no way ascribe to him a knowledge or a presence, which is above the condition of a creature. But if I invoke the saints every where, with assurance that they hear me, I have no other reasonable ground of such assurance, than that they are every where present at the same time : for if I acknowledge that there is a certain limited compass, within which they can hear and know ; let this limit be never so wide, how can I be assured that they are not out of that compass when I speak to them ? But the

Romanists pray every where to every saint, believing that they are heard. "It is certain," says one of them,* "that the saints know what we bring forth by the affection of the heart only." "It is of faith," saith another,† "that the blessed know our prayers which we pour out to them, else it were in vain to make them." Now a request does undoubtedly become prayer, or religious invocation, when the making of it attributes any Divine prerogative or perfection, to the being that is called upon; and therefore because immensity of presence is an incommunicable perfection of God; and because also requests made to those that are out of all lines of civil communication, being made in faith, do ascribe that power to them which is proper to God only: therefore such requests are proper prayer, or religious invocation. •

It is indeed very possible, that he that prays to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints, may not believe that they are omnipresent; but if he prays, as they pretend to do in the Roman Church, with assurance that they hear him, his prayer implies it, and himself, by construction of the fact, ascribes it to them: for let him, if he can, produce any other reasonable ground of assurance that they hear him, wheresoever and whensoever he addresses to them. But instead of that, M. de Meaux tells us, "That the Church contents herself to teach with all antiquity (not all antiquity I am sure) those prayers to be very profitable to such who make them, whether it be the saints know them, by the ministry and communication of angels, who, according to the testimony of the Scripture, know what passes amongst us, &c.‡ whether it be, that God himself makes known to them our desires by a particular revelation: or lastly, whether it be that he discovers the secret to them in his Divine essence, in which all truth is comprised." Now if his Church could have taught us, upon what grounds they are assured, that the saints do hear them, either this way or that way; or that God has in general revealed to us, that they hear or know the prayers we make to them one way or other, and therefore, that it is profitable to pray to them: she had not been content to teach, that the saints do know them some way or other, though she knows not how or why. For what foundation that they hear us can be gathered from such uncertain and loose conjectures as these are? Can any man convince me

* Bellar. de Sancti Beat. l. 1. c. 20.

† Pesant. 1. Thom. qu. 12. Art. 10. disput. 7. [p. 77. col. 2. Venet. 1606.]

‡ Exp. p. 8. [ut supra, p. 7.]

that a thing is done, by telling me, that it might be done by some way or other, for any thing he knows to the contrary? and is this kind of arguing a sufficient ground to establish so solemn a part of religion, as the invocation of saints? I know it is possible for God to reveal to my friend in the East Indies what I say here in England: but am I sure, that if I say to him an *Ora pro nobis*, at this distance, it reaches him forthwith? It were no difficult matter, if it were needful, to find them trouble enough to clear these very conjectures from absurdity; but as long as they are only conjectures, they can be no foundation of a certain persuasion. Whereas therefore M. de Meaux says, "It is manifest, that to say a creature may have a knowledge of these prayers by a light communicated to him by God, is not to elevate a creature above his condition." I say, it is as manifest, that this is no ground of certainty, that the saints hear our prayers at all; and if this be all they have to say, and yet will pretend to pray to them with faith, there is but one ground left for that faith, *viz.* "That the saints are every where present, and are therefore elevated above the condition of creatures." Which though some of themselves do not believe, yet their assurance to be heard being altogether unreasonable without that belief, their prayers do give the omnipresence of God to creatures; which is indeed the great reason why their addresses to the saints are properly prayers.

This therefore I lay down, and let them remove it if they can; that to invoke any creature, who is out of the compass of civil conversation, *i. e.* with whom I cannot converse, as we do with one another, by speaking within the known distances of hearing, or by writing, or messages, or the like, is in itself a vain and foolish thing, because he is out of distance. But if I pretend that it is profitable to invoke the saints, and this upon assurance that they hear me, though I can neither tell which way in particular, nor can shew in general that they do certainly hear me some way, that does not infer their omnipresence; there is no remedy, but my invocation of them must by consequence confess, that they are omnipresent.

Let therefore those of our communion say, that by calling upon God they do acknowledge his omnipresence, as well as his other infinite perfections; and that they are such acknowledgments, which make their invocation of them, religious invocation, or that which is prayer in the account of religion: and therefore, that they dare not call upon the saints departed; because they being without the compass of civil conversation,

or of such means of communication as we have with one another in this world, we cannot be reasonably assured that they hear us, unless we will suppose them to be omnipresent ; which as we do not believe, so we dare not do any thing that looks as if we did believe it.

Thus have I shewn what, in our judgment, makes the difference, between asking fit things of our brethren upon earth, and asking the same things of our brethren in heaven ; why one is not prayer, and the other is, *viz.* because the living are within our compass, and the dead are out of it. But whatever it is that makes the difference, since the honest requests we make to one another in this world, are not prayer, and the requests we make to the saints in heaven are prayer ; it does not follow that we may request the same thing of these, as we may of those : for if the argument be put into proper expressions, nothing can be more apparently inconsequent ; for then it would run thus : Because I make my requests known to those to whom I do not offer the religious worship of prayer in so doing, therefore I may represent my desires to those too, whom I cannot call upon, but my desires become the worship of prayer, or religious invocation.

And from hence it appears, that though this act of religious worship be given by those of the Roman Church to the meanest saint ; yet after the most plausible defence they make of their practice in so doing, it is not to be given to the most excellent creature, and therefore not to the blessed Virgin herself. And by this we may judge what a cause they have to maintain, who call upon the saints, and especially upon the blessed Virgin, in strains so unsuitable to the condition of creatures ; as they are whom they invoke : when, because they are but creatures, they ought not to invoke them at all, since they are out of that compass of conversation, in which only we could speak to them as to creatures, with faith that they hear us.

§. 4. To come to the next particular : when they kneel to the images of the blessed Virgin, and the saints, and prostrate, and humble themselves, and pray before them, we are given to understand, there is no harm in all this, because they attribute no other virtue to the images, but that of exciting the remembrance of those they represent ;* and their intention is not so much to honour the image, as to honour the Apostle or the

* Exp. p. 9. [Ibid. p. 8.]

martyr in the presence of the image.* As if the image were present to see and observe the honour that is done the Apostle or martyr! For it is no great honour that any body gets, by being honoured in the presence of mere wood or stone, that can neither see nor hear. This was an odd expression of M. de Meaux, this of "honouring the martyr in the presence of the image," no way suitable to the design of his exposition; but fitted only to the superstition of such people who have been made to believe, by the weeping and smiling images, and by the rolling of their eyes, and by the shaking of their heads and bodies, &c. that they are a kind of animated things. But to let this pass; what though M. de Meaux attributes no other virtues to images, but that of exciting remembrance? What though he takes a very commendable care in his diocese, to make the people stop there? Does he not know by experience; do not all wise men know it, and many honest men in the communion of that Church confess it, that in those images which the people are taught to present themselves before, with all the ceremonies of respect and veneration; there is another fatal virtue, and that is to excite devotion towards themselves, even to the demanding of favours from them, and putting trust in them? Is it not as notorious, that the wretched people are guilty of worshipping the images of the saints, no otherwise than they do the saints themselves, as that they worship the saints no otherwise than they worship God himself; as Ludov. Vives† complained. If it be said that these abuses may be provided against, and images may be still honoured (for honour is the word, though religious worship is the thing), I would know why men should make provisions in this case, as if they were wiser than God; who, to prevent these mischiefs, has forbidden image-worship altogether. If there were any such advantages to be made of it, in comparison to which the danger of it were nothing at all, how comes it to be so severely prohibited? But when we consider, for whose sake chiefly they pretend the profitableness of image worship, we see how true it is, that the wisdom of man is but foolishness, when it would mend the provisions of God. For images are by all means to be retained and honoured, because they are the books and remembrancers of the common people, and helps to their piety and devotions; who therefore

* P. 10. [Ibid.]

† Com. in Civit. Dei, lib. 8. c. 27. [p. 266. Basil. 1522.]

cannot be without them : but M. de Meaux* knows that these are most apt to be led into the worst superstitions by images, and that it is one of the hardest things in the world to prevent it.

M. de Meaux tells us, "their intention is not so much to honour the image as the Apostle or martyr." He will say too, that it is the intention of the Church, that none of the people should intend more than this comes to. But let him tell me how or where the Church has expressed herself, with the least degree of that zeal, which the redressing of such horrible abuses in this matter, as are every where known, does still require. The superstition of the vulgar, in their communion, is notorious ; and, which is still worse, the doctrines leading to the most superstitious opinions and practices in this kind, were and are notorious : for instance, that the same worship is due to the image, which is due to the prototype : and are not these things uncensured by the Church of Rome to this day ? If indeed we could once see that Church bestir herself against the gross excess of image-worship, as she does against those that do not worship images at all, we might allow something to this exposition of their intentions. But as far as we can see, they that worship the very images themselves, and put confidence in them, go for very good Catholics ; while we that dare not worship them at all, because God has forbidden it, are for our forbearance used as they use heretics.

But setting all this aside, what signifies the intention of the Church, if it ran through all the members of it, against an express prohibition in the Scriptures ? It is not lawful to do that with a distinction, which is forbidden without a distinction. God hath said, "Thou shalt not bow down to images, nor worship them." If indeed he had elsewhere made an exception to this rule, it had been lawful for us to have made use of his permission, it had been necessary for us to have observed his command in the excepted case. But where God hath not excepted or distinguished, we ought not to do so ; unless we will open a door to evacuate all Divine laws whatsoever, by arbitrary distinctions and reservations.

In short, that worship which they pretend to give to the saints by their images, has these two terrible prejudices against it.

* Trid. Sess. 25. De Invoc. S. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. Lut. Par. 1672.]

1. That the honour which they give to the saints by their images, supposing none of it to be lost by the way, is not to be given to the saints themselves ; as we have shewn already.

2. That the worship of images, let it be explicated with all the fineness and arts of disguise they are masters of, is, after all, to be utterly excluded out of religion. This being a worship which God will by no means endure should be given to himself, having universally prohibited it : "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is," &c. Which is, to my understanding, as plain a prohibition of all image-worship whatsoever, as these words would have been an injunction of it, *viz.* "Thou shalt make to thyself such or such images and pictures, and shalt bow down before them, and worship them," if this had been said instead of the contrary. Now indeed if this had been said, it had been extremely necessary to distinguish between relative worship and absolute worship, between worship terminated upon the image, and intended to the person represented by the image ; between taking it for a God or a saint, and taking it only for some representation of the one or the other. But as in that case such distinctions had been very necessary ; so as the case stands, they are vain and impertinent. For if image-worship had been commanded or permitted, still we had been to worship images, but as images : but it being forbidden, we are not to worship them at all. I say, if it had been allowed, we must indeed have worshipped them with a distinction, but as it is forbidden we must not worship them, though with a distinction ; because it is forbidden without any distinction, and as universally as words can express anything.

M. de Meaux says, that "after the same manner we ought to understand the honour which they pay to relics, after the example of the Primitive Church." The example of the Primitive Church shall be considered in its place. In the mean time, if the worship of images, and the worship of relics, are to stand or fall together, we have already seen what will become of this, having shewn how unsuccessfully they plead for the other. But if M. de Meaux pleads for the practice of the people, or even the doctrine of his Church in this point, he must pardon us, if we do not think fit to take general apologies, for a reasonable inducement to do those things which he was not willing to name in particular. "We may say in general," says M. de Meaux, "that if Protestants would but consider, how the affection which we bear to any

one propagates itself, without being divided, to his children, to his friends; and after that, by several degrees to the representation of him, to any remains of him, and to anything which renews in us his remembrance. If they did but conceive, that honour has the like progression, seeing honour is nothing else but love mixed with respect and fear: in fine, if they would but consider, that all the exterior worship of the Catholic Church has its source in God himself, and returns back again to him: they would never believe that this worship, which he himself alone animates, could excite his jealousy." M. de Meaux considered very well, that it was much better to put us off with this general account, than to mention the particulars he goes about to justify. It seems, the worship of relics is intended for the honour of the martyrs; and the worship of martyrs for the honour of God. But what kind of superstition might not be defended by such apologies as these? If men's blood, bones, teeth, hairs, coats, girdles, shoes, and such like little things, may be incensed; if they may be exposed with a *Venite ad adorandum*, to receive the prostrations of the people, in the presence of Christ himself, whom they suppose to be bodily present upon the altar:* if they may be sought unto for "great graces," and "for miraculous cures:" if they may be carried about to preserve a man from fire, from storms, from pestilence, from the danger of battle, and from ghostly as well as bodily enemies: if all this, I say, be but the effect of "a progression of honour," and may be brought off with a protestation, that the worship "is animated by God alone," and is performed for his sake.

Monsieur de Meaux says, that "if God, as jealous as he is of the love of men, does not look upon us as dividing ourselves between him and his creatures, when we love our neighbour for the love of him; the same God, though jealous of the honour which his faithful pay him, cannot look upon them as dividing that worship, which is due to him alone, when out of respect to him, they honour those whom he hath honoured." But as there may be an inordinate love of our neighbour, whom yet God hath commanded us to love; so there may be an inordinate honour given by us, even to those whom God hath honoured: and if we go beyond the bounds that God hath set us, in loving the one, and honouring the other; if we love our neighbour, as we should love God only; if we honour the

* Catech. R. de Cultu Sanct. [p. 356. Mechlin. 1831.]

martyrs and saints, as God only ought to be honoured; it will, I presume, be no sufficient excuse to say, that it was done out of "respect to God." The thing which M. de Meaux should have spoken to, but has not, is this, that the honour they pay to relics is no part of that worship which is due to none but God. Without this, it is in vain to flourish out a general notion which no man denies, *viz.* that we may so love the faithful, and honour the martyrs, and the very relics of martyrs, as not to divide between them and God, the love and worship which is due to him alone. The truth is, M. de Meaux had a very hard task in the "Exposition" of the veneration which they give to relics: for whereas he had some colour to insist upon the moderation of his Church, in the business of images, since the Council of Trent declares, that there is no virtue in them, for which they ought to be revered, or trusted in; yet he wanted such a declaration as this, as to the business of relics, and could not say, that either the Council or the Catechism declares against believing "any virtue in relics;" since notwithstanding the caution they have used in the manner of expression, both the one and the other teach the contrary. So that the superstition of relics in the Roman Church is greater than that of images. And therefore M. de Meaux had nothing to do, but to set off the whole matter by general apologies, because it would not bear a defence of the particulars. But of this I shall say no more, because the exposition he makes of their doctrine and practice, as to this matter, is very like to that which he makes of the general difference between that worship which they give to God alone, and that which they give to the blessed Virgin and the saints. Which is the next thing I am to consider.

§. 5. They teach, that "the adoration which is due to God alone, consists principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things; and in adhering to him with all the powers of our soul, by faith, hope, and charity, as to him alone, who can render us happy, by the communication of an infinite good, which is himself.*" This interior adoration has its exterior marks; of which the principal is sacrifice, which cannot be offered to any but to God; because a sacrifice is established to make a public acknowledgment, and a solemn protestation

* Exp. [ut supra.] p. 4.

of God's sovereignty, and our absolute dependence." Thus the worship they give to God only is described. Concerning the worship they give to the blessed Virgin and the saints, thus M. de Meaux speaks: "The Church teaches us, that all religious worship ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end; and that if the honour which she renders to the blessed Virgin and to the saints, may in some sense be called religious, it is for its necessary relation to God."*

We shall now be better able to examine the difference, which he puts in general between the "adoration which is due to God alone," and that honour which they "render to the blessed Virgin and the saints," because we have seen in great part, "in what this honour consists."

What M. de Meaux has said concerning the inward adoration of God, is exceedingly well said. But if we go on, and take altogether, we cannot but discern that this great man had laboured his thoughts into such words, as should provide, with great appearance of piety, for the honour of God, that we might not be offended; while yet he was to save some of it for "the blessed Virgin and the saints," that he might not seem to desert the cause of his Church.

For whereas he distinguisheth between the inward and outward worship, which is due to God only, he avoids that distinction in speaking of the honour which they render to the blessed Virgin and the saints; for it had been a dangerous way of exposing the doctrine of the pretended Catholics, to tell us what *inward* or *mental* worship is to be given them.

Whereas the title of the section is,† that "religious worship is terminated in God alone;" when he was to speak of the honour they render to the blessed Virgin and to the saints, he qualifies it with this supposition, "if it may in some sense be called religious." Now to say, "if it be religious;" nay, "if it be called religious," and that but in "some sense" too, are very new and surprising ways of expression; and would make one suspect that all of them are not fully satisfied in giving a worship to the blessed Virgin and to the saints; which, without all question, is, and therefore ought to be called, religious worship; as those that have gone before them in this cause, have without scruple called it.

He gives this reason why sacrifice is to be offered to God only: "because a sacrifice is established to make a public ac-

* Exp. p. 5. [Ibid. p. 4.]

† Sect. 3.

knowledge, and a solemn profession of God's sovereignty, and our absolute dependence." But when he should give a proportionable reason why his Church renders to the blessed Virgin and to the saints, the honour of praying to them; which is one instance he presently names, he slips it over and pretends no more, than that "all religious worship ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end; and if it may be called religious, it is because of its necessary relation to him." Now he should have said, prayer is established to make a public acknowledgment and solemn protestation, as well of the power and excellency of the blessed Virgin and the saints, as of the perfection of God. But though the nature of his discourse required some such reason, yet the nature of his design would not bear it, which was to remove the "frightful ideas" of his religion, which we have entertained, and to represent it in a more agreeable and pleasing form, than we have yet known it by.

Other observations of this kind might be made, to make it probable, that it cost even M. de Meaux some little trouble to contrive his discourse into this plausible appearance, and to shew that it is no easy matter, at the same time, to make a smooth representation of their religion, and not to change it. But I shall now offer my reasons, to shew the unsatisfactoriness of his Exposition in this cause, as he hath formed it.

1. Setting aside their profession of "one God," which is supposed in the question concerning his particular worship: I find no outward mark of the adoration that is due to God only mentioned, but that of "sacrifice," which indeed M. de Meaux says, is the "principal." But in a point of this consequence, I wish he had been pleased to name the rest. But I think I may appeal to the sincerity of M. de Meaux, whether by sacrifice he means anything more than the "sacrifice of the mass;" in which they pretend to offer up Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his natural body, soul, and divinity, as a propitiation for the quick and the dead: for my part, I cannot find, but they give all other outward marks of adoration to the blessed Virgin, but this; so that the worship given to God, and that to her, are distinguished I fear but by one mark. And what a rare account is this of God's incommunicable worship, if that mark too should prove to be one of their own inventions; if such a sacrifice as that was not appointed by God; if indeed it be repugnant to the plain authority of the Scripture; as the Exposition of our doctrine hath irrefragably

shewn, in a very little compass! This is my first exception, that all the outward marks of religious worship, which God hath established, they make common to God and the saints; and that which they give to God only, they have made themselves.

2. Even this very sacrifice of the mass is offered up by them in honour of the blessed Virgin and the saints: for thus the oblation runs in their Missals; "Accept, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we offer unto thee, in honour of the most glorious Virgin, the mother of God," &c. Now surely they would not offer God himself in sacrifice to a creature. But it comes something near it, to offer up such a sacrifice in honour of a creature. For while this is done, how can it be said, that sacrifice is reserved to be a protestation of that honour which is "due to God only."

3. They "burn incense" to the blessed Virgin and the saints; which being done as a religious rite in their honour, will hardly avoid being a sacrifice. For though this rite of burning incense was no part of the religion that Jesus or his Apostles taught, nor used at all in the ancient Church: yet it should seem to be no less a sacrifice now, than it was among the Jews, or than it would have been if it had been transferred from the Synagogue into the Church. I suppose, if the Church of Rome had thought fit to introduce the oblations of beasts and birds into her religious worship, she could not deny but such oblations had been properly sacrifices, and were to be made to God only: and that though it were Judaism to offer them at all, it were yet idolatry to offer them to any but to God. But what should make any such difference between "slaying of victims," and "burning of incense;" that the former should belong to God only, and not the latter, I cannot comprehend: for the "altar of incense was most holy unto the Lord;" it was overlaid with gold, which the altar of "burnt-offerings" was not; and it was more holy than the altar of burnt-offerings, as standing in the more holy place; and "none but the seed of Aaron was to come near to offer incense before the Lord." No wonder therefore that Hezekiah brake in pieces the "brazen serpent," when they burnt incense to it; for this was no less than offering sacrifice to it. To conclude, the idolatry which the heathens sought to bring the Christians to, was no other than to take a little in their hands, and to throw it into the fire of their altars. But yet they burn incense to the images and relics of the blessed Virgin and

the saints : and then how can they pretend to sacrifice to God only ? But,

4. Setting all this aside, let us consider that they grant sacrifice is to be offered to God only, because it is established to make a public acknowledgment, and a solemn protestation of God's sovereignty, and of our absolute dependence. Now if this be true, then whatsoever is established for the same purpose, is holy to the Lord also. And therefore religious invocation, by prayers, for good things, by confessions of sin, by vows of repentance and duty, and by thanksgivings for benefits received, is to be offered to God only. For in truth, these are acknowledgments and protestations of God's sovereignty, and of our absolute dependence. Nay, in truth, they are more noble and excellent sacrifices, than those victims, and other more sensible oblations, which God required under the law, or before it, and which he does not require now. But that which I lay the greatest stress upon, is this, that those material sacrifices were so many rites and ceremonies of invocation, diversified according to the several ends of invocation, either for confessing of sin, or obtaining a benefit, or returning praises for benefits received. Hence it is, that prayer and sacrifice are put one for the other in the holy Scriptures, as when it is said, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is his delight :"* by which words it is plain, that the sacrifice of the wicked is his prayer, and the prayer of the upright is his sacrifice. Now prayer and sacrifice, strictly so called, were both acts of worship ; but prayer more excellent than sacrifice, because sacrifice was the rite of prayer, and a rite which God required no longer, than till that most precious sacrifice of the Son of God was offered for us ; the merit of which alone it is, that made the prayers of good men in all ages acceptable to God.

And by the way, it would be considered by the gentlemen of the Church of Rome, that when those imperfect sacrifices, which prefigured the oblation of Jesus Christ once for all, were offered under the law, the prayers of God's people were then made only to God. And therefore now, that the prayers of the Church are sanctified by the accomplishment of the sacrifice of the Son of God, to offer any of them to a creature, is rather a greater dishonour to God, than it would have been before. For if the Patriarchs and the Jews were to pray to


* Prov. [xv. 8.]

him only, to whom alone they offered sacrifice, *i. e.* to God; much more shall the sacrifice of the Son of God, which hath been actually offered for us, infer our obligation to make all our prayers and religious invocations to God only, to whom we have access by the merit of that sacrifice.

• But this I insist upon, that if we compare the legal sacrifices with the prayers of God's people under the law; these were no less protestations of God's sovereignty, and man's absolute dependence, than those were; and that the house of God was no less denominated by a service peculiar to him, in being called an house of prayer, than if it had been called an house of sacrifice, as it was an house of sacrifice too. A house of sacrifice to the Jews, and a house of prayer to all nations.

Now, if these more spiritual and reasonable sacrifices of a penitent and broken heart, a believing and humble heart, a devout and thankful heart offered in religious invocation, are such acknowledgments as M. de Meaux speaks of; then are they not to be offered to the blessed Virgin, and the saints, but to God only. And what now is it that M. de Meaux means by terminating the honour they render to the blessed Virgin upon God? Is it this, that the honour done to her, by invoking her with prayers, hymns, confessions of sin, vows, and devoting themselves to her service, is all intended by the Church for the honour of God? I would then know why any sacrifice may not also be offered directly to the Virgin, the Church intending that the honour of it should terminate upon God, and believing that he has all the honour of it at last. No, say they, sacrifice is established to make a public acknowledgment of God's sovereignty. But then I add, that religious invocation is established to make such an acknowledgment too. So that if terminating religious worship upon God, will warrant giving it to the blessed Virgin and the saints, their Church may give to them that worship of the more sensible sacrifices, which yet they pretend to deny. And if no worship is to be given to the saints, which is established to make a solemn acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and our dependence, they must deny to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints, that more spiritual worship of prayers, hymns, and vows, which they give. Nor will they ever be able to avoid these difficulties, but by coming out of the clouds, and confessing, according to the plainness and the simplicity of the Scriptures, that all religious worship is due to God, and to

him only, inasmuch as religious worship is established to make an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and our absolute dependence: and public acts of religious worship, to make public and solemn acknowledgments thereof.

§. 6. Thus I have considered the defence that M. de Meaux has made of the worship of the blessed Virgin and the saints, as it is practised in the Church of Rome; and I promise myself, that whoever shall seriously consider what has been said, will not be encouraged, by the exposition of this practice, to venture upon it. I know that many of the Roman Church fortify themselves against all our arguments upon these points, by this persuasion: that so long as they do not make gods of the saints, but believe and profess that there is but one God, infinite in all perfections; all the honours they give to the blessed Virgin and the saints are to be interpreted by this protestation: that they have no other God but the Creator of the world; nor Lord, but the Saviour of  kind. But if they, in this manner, assure themselves, and would encourage others, I beseech them to consider, and would to God they would all consider but this one thing: that if the sin of idolatry could not take place, where there is such a profession, and such a faith in one God (though I more than fear the contrary); yet the saint-worship of the Roman Church does approach so very near it, and is so very like it, that even this (if no more were to be said) should be a sufficient reason to deter us from it. A woman that is faithful to her husband will not only forbear doing the utmost injury to him, by giving his bed to another; but she will avoid all those familiarities and caresses with any other man, which are scandalous, which lead to the least treachery, and which would provoke her husband's jealousy. Now God has described his people's relation to him, by the relation of a wife to her husband; not only in the Old Testament, but in the New; from whence it is that the worship of other gods is called fornication, whoredom, and adultery. Thus God charged the Jews for* inflaming themselves with idols, under every green tree, and setting up their beds upon every lofty and high mountain, and enlarging their beds, because they had many idols. Thus it was said of Israel, that she had,† "through the lightness of her whoredoms, defiled the land, and committed adultery with stocks and

* Isa. lvii. 5, 7.

† Jerem. iii. 6, 9.

stones." This is the language of the whole 16th chapter of Ezekiel; where God threatened to judge the Jews as women that break wedlock are judged, and would give them their reward in fury.

Now supposing that there were no other idolatry in the nature of the thing; no other spiritual whoredom and fornication, but worshipping that for God which is not God; and that if we do but make this difference between the worship that we give to God, and that which we give to his courtiers and favourites; that still we acknowledge them to be creatures, and not gods; servants, and not lords; and so do not give them that last and distinguishing honour, which to give, would, by the confession of all, be spiritual adultery in the highest degree: supposing this, I say; yet let us in the name of God consider, that to give religious worship to creatures, as well as to God; to fall down to images, as well as to God; and to give almost quite throughout the same outward expressions of honour, of faith, of love, of religious expectation and dependence to the blessed Virgin, and to saints and angels, which we give to God; if it be not downright whoredom, is yet a whorish behaviour, and more than sufficient to provoke the Lord to jealousy. I cannot but speak in the language of the Scripture, upon an argument that the Scriptures so largely treat of in this language.

It is worthy of much observation, that God gives this very reason why he prohibited the worshipping of images: "For I the Lord thy God, am a jealous God." And that we might not think it a light matter to provoke his jealousy, he adds, "and I visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." I know who they are, that would fain believe the worship of no other images, but those of the gods of the Gentiles, to be forbidden in the second commandment. But I must needs say, upon this occasion, that if that had been the only design of that commandment, it is very strange that God should note the worshipping of the heathen gods with no other penalty, than that which his jealousy would inflict: for to have any other gods besides him, is without all question, spiritual whoredom; and had been threatened with divorce, if the prohibition of so great a crime had needed the sanction of any express threatening. But when he threatens the worship of images with the effects of his jealousy; it seems plain, that he means such image-worship as is consistent with acknowledging him to be

our only God. And yet this is the least of all those reasons, by which it appears to me, that he forbids, in this commandment, the worship of all images whatsoever. I deny not therefore but a man may kneel, may kiss, may incense, may prostrate himself, and pray before an image; and all this while ascribe no divinity to it, nor take it to be his god. So likewise he may pray, and make vows, and offer thanks and praises to the saints, and to the blessed Virgin, and not take them neither for his gods. But because God is the peerless majesty of heaven and earth, he will be served with a peerless worship; he will therefore have no such things as these done in religion, nor creatures to have respect shewn them, that looks so like to the worship which he requires himself. Why do I say, so like? That which they give to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints, is almost the very same. But if we do such things as these, it will not serve our turn to plead, that we still keep the inward adoration of spirit and truth entirely for him, though we thus honour his creatures with religious rites and services, any more than it would excuse a woman that had given all the favours and liberty to another man, that could provoke her husband's jealousy, to say (though she could say it with truth) that she remembered all the while who was her husband; and whatever liberties besides she used, that she had still kept his bed undefiled.

This consideration I could not forbear to use; and that in compassion to those whose prejudices will not let them feel the sense of those reasonings, by which we prove the Roman Church to be guilty of downright idolatry. For if the fear of God's jealousy would keep them from giving those honours to the saints, which look so like divine honours, if they are not so, we should gain our end upon them, though not by the force of the best arguing the case will bear: and this is our end, that God may not be any more dishonoured, and their salvation hindered, by the unchristian doctrines and practices of this sort. I have therefore now proceeded upon this supposition, that they are not guilty of perfect idolatry in those things which we complain of, and yet shewn what urgent cause there is upon another account for a reformation of them. But I conclude this, with professing, that I have supposed them not guilty of that fearful crime, only to make way for another argument, since all arguments are to be used in so important a matter, that have a foundation of truth; but not in distrust of those arguments which prove them guilty of it.

§. 7. The second thing I propounded was, to shew the beginnings of this strange worship amongst Christians, which they offer in the Church of Rome to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints. For I must not forget, that M. de Meaux pretends, that his Church in these things teaches "as the Primitive Church" taught, and that she does what she teaches with all antiquity.

But what if nothing of all this was either taught or done in the Church for 360 years after Christ? M. de Meaux says, that "those of the pretended Reformation (obliged by the strength of truth) begin to acknowledge, that the custom of praying to saints, and honouring their relics, was established even in the fourth age of the Church." This he takes all occasions to insinuate, and with these colours he serves himself to represent the Reformation as odiously as he can devise. Thus he tells us in his Pastoral Letter: "But above all, what horror are they worthy of, who cast the accusation (of idolatry) upon the whole Church, and also on the Church of the first ages?"* Where he takes it for granted, that the honour and innocence of the first ages must stand or fall with the cause of the Roman Church, and so takes occasion to accuse us of a great and fearful crimes, *viz.* that "we cast the accusation of idolatry upon the whole Church, even the Church of the first ages:" he had observed but just before, that "those who bear false and scandalous witness against an innocent person, are condemned to the same punishment, which the crime of which they bear witness did deserve, had it been found true." And therefore, "we deserve before men, the horror which is due to idolatry, and shall receive the just punishment thereof in the sight of God." If this rule be true, and we must incur the penalties of idolatry, if we falsely accuse others of it, M. de Meaux ought to reflect upon himself, who having accused us of "falsely accusing the first ages" in this matter, supports his accusation by taking these two things for granted: first, that we acknowledge "the illustrious fourth age to have requested the prayers of martyrs, and honoured relics,"† as the pretended Catholics have done since. Secondly, that the fourth age being granted them, the first three must be theirs in course. If M. de Meaux be safe upon these grounds, we have no great cause to apprehend the horrors and punishments of false accusation: and if this be all he hath to say, it is but

* Past. L. [ut supra] p. 29.

† Ibid.

a very slender ground for an appeal to the Primitive Church, and to all antiquity. For neither have the Reformed acknowledged heretofore, nor do they now "begin to acknowledge,"* that the customs of the Roman Church, in these points, were established in the fourth age of the Church. Nor if they did acknowledge it, would this acknowledgment give away the Primitive Church, and all antiquity, in favour of praying to saints, and worshipping of saints and relics, unless the first three ages were less ancient and primitive than those that followed.

That which we acknowledge, is not that saint-worship was "established in the fourth age;" but this, that towards the latter end of the fourth age, some unhappy occasions were given for the establishing of that worship in after ages, which we could wish had never been given, and which the great men of those days (we have reason to believe) would have prevented, if they had been prophets, as well as holy men, and foreseen the mischiefs into which they were ripened by the superstitions of after-times.

I shall therefore demonstrate, that it is a vain thing for the pretended Catholics to presume, that they have the authority of the three first ages, for the worship of saints, images, and relics, upon supposition that the doctors, towards the close of the fourth age, were theirs in these points. And then I shall not fear to give the truest account I can of those practices at that time, which grew afterwards into the superstitions we now complain of.

Monsieur de Meaux says, "It will not appear very likely that M. Daille should understand the sentiments of the Fathers of the three first ages, better than those who gathered, as I may say, the succession of their doctrine after their deaths." These gentlemen, I perceive, will content themselves with any pretence, to shift off the trial of their doctrines and practices by the authority of the three first ages. For whether that be likely or not, which M. de Meaux here puts, yet I hope we may look into the writings of the most primitive Fathers, to see how things went in their times. And it is very likely that M. Daille might understand the sentiments of the Fathers of the three first ages, as well as he understood the sentiments of those of the fourth. And so long as we can have recourse to the undoubted writings of the three first ages, we may get the

* Id. p. 8. [Exp. ut supra, p. 4.]

doctrine of those Fathers this way, with a little more assurance, than by guessing what their sentiments were by the books of their successors; which every reasonable man must acknowledge, unless it be reasonable to suppose, that the Fathers of the three first ages did not understand their own sentiments so well as the Fathers of the fourth understood them.

Now, in the first place, the profound silence of the three first ages, and the better half of the fourth, as to the worship of the blessed Virgin and the saints, and their images and relics, should be enough to determine the first point in question. And this silence is not only directly confessed by some of our adversaries, but as effectually confessed by the rest, that labour to find some hints of these practices in these primitive Fathers; but by such interpretations and consequences, that it is almost as great a shame to confute as to make them. Now the silence of these Fathers ought not to be rejected as an incompetent proof, because it is but a negative. For since we pretend that these practices are innovations, and were never heard of in the ancient Church, it is not reasonable to demand a better proof of it, than that in their books, some of which give large and particular accounts of their worship, and of their doctrines concerning worship, we can no where meet with the least intimation or footstep of them. Would our adversaries have us bring express testimonies out of the Fathers against these things, as if they wrote and disputed by the spirit of prophecy, against those corruptions that should arise several ages after they were dead? We have, as I shall shew, other ways of discovering their sentiments, besides this, that they make not the least mention of these services. But to demand more than their perpetual silence in these cases, is unreasonable; because no satisfactory account can be given of it but this, that the worship we speak of was indeed no part of their religion. Had it been some indifferent rite or ceremony that we contend about, this argument, from the silence of the Fathers, against its antiquity, might with some colour be rejected; because it were unreasonable to expect, that they should take notice in their writings of every custom, of how little moment soever. And yet we find, that in matters even of this slight nature in comparison, they have not been wanting to give us very much information. But it is altogether incredible, that so notable and famous a part of the worship of Christians, as that which is now given to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints, should not be mentioned by any one of them, if it had been the custom of those times. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Minu-

tius 'Felix, all the Apologists, or at least one of them, would have taken some notice of it; especially since this part of their religion would have needed exposition and defence, more than all the rest; for it would have made them obnoxious to the recriminations of the heathens, and brought all their own arguments upon themselves, which they had used against the heathens, in defence of their own worshipping the one God, and him only.

But perhaps they all agreed to conceal this saint-worship from the heathens, for the same reason why Salmeron thinks the Apostles and Evangelists concealed it at first from both Jews and Gentiles, "because," forsooth, "it had been hard to require it of the Jews* (who had been taught to pray to God only, and to worship none but him), and," by publishing it, "occasion had been given to the Gentiles to think, that many gods were now offered them, instead of that multitude of gods which they had forsaken." A very likely reason thus far: that if this had been the doctrine of the Church, it was highly necessary to keep it secret, till heathen idolatry were extinguished, and none should be left to upbraid the Christians with removing the old gods of the heathens, to make way for new ones of their own. And without all doubt, those that were prevailed upon in every persecution, by force and flattery, to revolt from Christianity, though they had been false to the rest of their religion, yet were true to this secret of it; and never discovered to the heathens, that (whatever the Church pretended) they had been taught to say *Ave Mariæ* to the blessed Virgin, and to worship her and the dead saints and martyrs with prayers and hymns, &c. I thank this Jesuit, however, for confessing so manifest a truth, that this adoration of saints was not fit to be exposed to the Gentiles. But if matters were carried thus, I think they were not carried with great sincerity. This might be like the policy of Jesuits; but it did not by any means become the simplicity of Christians! and yet I think, a Jesuit would hardly have carried a secret in his sleeve, so dangerous to be discovered, and so impossible to be concealed. For that the Church should have the good fortune to conceal it for above 300 years, from the idolatrous philosophers and priests of the Gentiles, was, of all other things that passed in that long time, the most miraculous; and requires such a faith to believe it, as believes a thing the more, the more incredible it is. But though this, in the opinion of all indifferent

* Salmer. in 1 Tim. 2. Disp. 8. [vol. 15. p. 473. col. 1. Colon. Agr. 1604.]

persons, will be a sufficient prejudice against supposing that the Church kept her doctrine and practice from the knowledge of her enemies; yet I believe it will be a stronger prejudice against it, amongst those (of which number I profess myself to be one) that honour the memories of the ancient martyrs, and love them for their constancy to the death, in adhering to our dear Lord and Master Jesus; that this crafty design is no way reconcileable to that spirit of integrity which the Gospel frames us to, if we are true Christians; and of which they, if any, were undeniable examples. One would think, therefore, that if the heathens knew no such doctrines and practices amongst the Christians, that the Christians had none such to be known. And in the opinion of Salmeron himself, had those known any such thing, these had not failed to have heard of it. Why then did they not charge the Christians with worshipping the blessed Virgin, when nothing would have been more pertinent and apposite? I will give one instance of this question, so clear and full, that it shall render all others needless. There was nothing that Celsus insisted upon, against the Christians worshipping Jesus Christ, with more spite and triumph, than that Jesus was, as he called him, "a most vile person, taken, beaten, and crucified." It was for this he scorned the Christians, that they should count him the Son of God;* and worship him now dead, who lived and died ignominiously. It must be uneasy for a Christian to write or read his blasphemies upon this occasion.† But there is one place that I must not forbear; and that is, where the fœsaïd wretch brings in a Jew, and with the Jew, does himself upbraid Jesus,‡ that he was "born in a little town of Judæa, and that of a wandering woman, miserably poor, that spun for her living; who was also for adultery thrown out of doors by the carpenter her husband; and being thus driven away by him, and wandering up and down in a base fashion, brought forth Jesus in a corner." Thus did that accursed villain blaspheme the blessed Virgin, in despite to Jesus her most holy Son; I say, in despite to him, because he was worshipped by the Christians. By bringing forth the execrable stories of the Jews concerning the mother, the impious infidel designed to make the Church of God ashamed of worshipping her Son; whom he sought to disparage this way, as well as by objecting

* Orig. contra Cels. lib. 2, 3.

† Ibid. lib. 7, 8.

‡ Orig. lib. 1. cont. Cel. [Ibid. vol. 1, p. 346.]

the poverty of his life, and the ignominy of his death. But suppose, I beseech you, that the Church in those days had honoured the mother of Jesus, little less than Jesus himself; that she had been called the Queen of Heaven: that the story of her assumption had been then invented: that she had been worshipped as the Lady of the World, and served with prayers, and vows, and incense, and with all, or with any of those religious rites, that she is now served with? Would that spiteful wretch have failed to reproach the enemies of his gods with so plain a matter of reproach? Did he think they had reason to be ashamed of making so helpless and so unfortunate a man, as the Pagans took Jesus to be, the object of a most excellent worship;* and would he not have thought it a greater shame, if they had given a superexcellent worship to so helpless and so scandalous a woman, as the false miscreant reckoned the mother to be? Did they insult over the Christians for making a God of the Son of such a mother? What would they have said, if the Church had given them the least occasion to suspect, that it had made a goddess of the mother herself? But of this not one word is to be met with, in all the reproaches of the infidel; no, nor of Trypho or Cæcilius, or any the most bitter enemies of the Christian name, for the three first ages; where it lay as fair to be taken up, as argument and occasion could make it. What account then is to be given of this omission? It was no omission of theirs at all; the Church had not yet given them this handle against itself: no such things as these were known amongst Christians, and therefore their enemies did not lay them to their charge: their enemies, I say, who falsely accused them, as to other matters, upon the most slight and frivolous occasions. They accused them of worshipping an ass's head; of killing a child at their solemn assemblies; and of adultery and incest, as you may see in Minutius Felix, and elsewhere; and all this upon the most ridiculous grounds imaginable. But it seems the Christians paid religious worship to the Virgin, and to dead men and women; and their watchful enemies were content to say never a word of it. Alas! these wise men did not know, that the Christians derided them for such things as these; perhaps they were always deaf when it was told them that the Christians did the same things themselves; or they had quite forgotten it, when it was most proper to remember

* Ibid. lib. 8.

it ; or were so silly, as not to discern the advantage they were to make of it ; or so imprudent, as to accuse them of other things, which could be easily disproved, rather than to accuse them of those things which could not be denied. The children of this world were now grown fools in their generation. He that can believe these things, let him believe them !

I shall add this only, that when the least occasions were once given to suspect that the martyrs were worshipped by the Church, the heathens immediately laid hold on the pretence, especially Julian* and Eunapius, who urged the accusation with all the stings of malice ; as their predecessors in this cause against Christ would certainly have done, had there been the least colour for it.

But to return to the Virgin Mary : we have seen that in these latter ages the doctrine of her worship is grown to be no mean part of the body of divinity, with the doctors of the Roman Church. There is no end of writing books to her honour, and to excite and direct devotion to her. A sermon cannot be preached, but she must be addressed to with an *Ave Mary* ; nor a large volume written, but it is odds, that it is concluded with "praise to God, and to the virgin mother Mary." One would therefore expect to find all things full of veneration and address to the blessed Virgin in the writings of the primitive Fathers, that is, to meet with it at every turn in their expositions of the faith, in their exhortations to devotion and piety, and in all their homilies to the people. But if you look for any such thing, I will be bold to say, you will lose your labour ; unless it were some satisfaction to find, that the world is very much altered from what it was, and the state of religion not a little changed.

But the worst is, that what these Fathers say of her, is but very little in comparison, and that not of set purpose, but incidentally and occasionally, as they were led to it by other things. I know not how the Fathers can be excused, but that the Scriptures speak as sparingly of her as they.

It were something, however, if their occasional passages concerning her intimated a greater regard to her service in their practice, than they have shewn in their writings ; or if they discovered but some obscure prints and footsteps of such a devotion to her, as we seek for. Let us therefore see after what manner they speak of the blessed Virgin.

* Cyril. contra Julian. l. 6. [vol. 6. p. 201. Lutet. 1638.]

I observe, that the highest strains in her service run upon a comparison between her and Eve. Thus Justin Martyr,* who says very little else of her, tells us, that "Eve being a virgin conceived by the word of the serpent, and brought forth death: but the Virgin Mary receiving the message of the angel, conceived in faith; therefore that which was born of her was holy, *viz.* the Son of God." He proves also against Trypho,† that Christ was to be born of a virgin, according to the prophets.

After Justin comes Irenæus, and with greater circumstance pursues the forementioned comparison, against those stupid heretics, that denied God to be the Creator of all things, and that he used his own works. For against these, Irenæus, amongst other arguments, produced this, that Christ took flesh of Mary. And then he proceeds to shew, how convenient it was that he should be born of a virgin. First,‡ he opposes the disobedience in the case of the forbidden tree, by which sin came into the world, to that obedience which was performed upon a tree, by him that brought life to the world. He opposes also the cheat that was put upon Eve, to the truth that was told Mary. He opposes the virgin Eve, now designed to be a wife, to the virgin Mary, who was also espoused; and the virgin Eve deceived by an evil angel, to the virgin Mary believing a good angel. "And," says he, "as Eve was seduced and forsook God, so Mary was induced to obey God, that the virgin Mary might be a comforter§ of the virgin Eve; and that as mankind was, through a virgin, bound over to death, so they should be released through a virgin. One thing being thus rightly balanced against another, the disobedience of a virgin by the obedience of a virgin." The sum of all is this, that there appeared a notable congruity, in divers respects, that as Eve, a virgin, led the first man Adam into transgression,

* Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 327. Paris. [p. 195. Par. 1742.]

† P. 290. [Ibid. p. 163.]

‡ Iren. lib. 5. c. 18, 19. [p. 315, 316. Venet. 1734.]

§ The word which I translate *comforter*, is in Latin *advocata*; from whence Bellarmine and Fevardentius conclude very absurdly, in behalf of invocation of saints, though Irenæus meant what we usually understand by *advocate*. But by the fidelity of the Latin translator, in keeping to the ecclesiastical use of words, it seems evident, that the Greek word in Irenæus was *παράκλητος*; which, how it is to be translated, see M. Daille, who has largely treated this matter; and I doubt not to say, has made an end of it. De Relig. cultus Object. p. 41, &c. [Genev. 1664.]

in whom all mankind fell; so the Virgin Mary brought forth him into the world, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, who was to redeem all mankind. No honest man will go about to make less of these passages; but he must be a very subtle man that can make more of them.

And yet Fevardentius triumphs in this testimony, as if he had found here the Primitive Church, and all antiquity, for the invocation of the blessed Virgin. And no less satisfied he was with a like strain of Irenæus against those heretics, in another place, who said, that "Christ took nothing from the Virgin Mary,"* and by consequence that she was not really his mother, nor he really, but only seemingly, a man. Now, amongst other things, Irenæus argues the contrary, from the congruity of our Saviour's being born of a virgin, that a virgin might bring as much good to the world, as a virgin had done mischief; whereby it became plain, that God defeated the devil in a congruous way; who, by the virgin Eve, had seduced Adam, and brought death upon his posterity. But why did not Irenæus complain, that this heresy overthrew the very foundation upon which the Church gave a superexcellent worship to Mary, *viz.* because she was the mother of God? Nay, why did not he silence this wild conceit, by alleging the worship which she every where received upon this account? Fevardentius elsewhere makes a mighty matter of Irenæus' pressing heretics with catholic tradition. Why therefore was not so obvious and convincing an argument as the catholic tradition and practice of worshipping the Virgin Mary brought forth upon this occasion? Even because there was no such tradition or practice to be alleged, as any man that is not overruled with prejudice must confess. It is a sign that ancient testimonies run very low with them, when they are fain to make much of these.

But if Irenæus forgot this argument, it is something strange that Tertullian after him should forget it too: for writing against the same stupid opinions, he uses just the argument that Irenæus had done before him: "The image and similitude of God,"† saith he, "being captivated by the devil, God recovered it by a work that defeated the devil in his own way. For the word that was a foundation of death had crept into Eve, being

* Adv. Hær. lib. 3. c. 32, 33. [ut supra, p. 218, 219.]

† *Æmula operatione.* Tert. de carne Christi, c. 25. [c. 17.] [p. 321. Par. 1695.] Adv. Praxeam, c. 27. [Ibid. p. 516.]

yet a virgin ; and agreeably the word that should restore life, was to be received by a virgin ; that mankind, who by means of that sex, fell into perdition, might, through the same sex, be recovered to salvation. Eve had believed the serpent, Mary hath believed Gabriel ; the offence which the former hath committed in believing, the latter hath blotted out by believing." And what he means by blotting out Eve's offence, is plain from what follows, that " Mary brought forth him who was to save even his murderers," and that " Christ was to come of her for the salvation of man." What Tertullian says of her beside, is very little, and by the bye ; as that she was a virgin, because " Christ was said to be made of a woman ;" and that being born of her, " he was therefore of the house of David ;" and the like.

Clemens Alexandrinus, to illustrate a moral lesson tells us, " that Mary was a perfect virgin after the birth of her Son,"* and mentions a particular proof of it, which some affirmed. And farther he says not, that I can remember.

His scholar Origen acknowledged also the perpetual virginity of Mary : and in his homilies upon the 1st chapter of St. Luke, where he could not avoid speaking of her, he hath these passages : " Somebody,"† saith he, " I know not who, hath run into such a madness, as to affirm that Mary was renounced by our Saviour, inasmuch as after his birth she was joined to Joseph."‡ Now if the Church had then believed the story of her assumption (which has been so poetically described to us of late) : if the Church had then, for an hundred and fifty years together, served her as the queen of heaven, with solemn rites of worship ; that man who ventured to disparage the blessed Virgin in this fashion, was foolish to admiration. But if Origen knew that the Church had given her these honours from the beginning, he was wise enough to have stopped this madman's mouth with that argument, or rather to have said nothing of him ; since nobody could need any instruction to hold him for a ridiculous fellow. But he thought fit to instruct the people, how they should answer this man ; and that in this manner : " If Mary was pronounced blessed in those hymns that were uttered by the instinct of the Holy Spirit ; how can any man say that our Saviour denied her ?"

* Strom. lib. 7. [p. 889. Venet. 1757.]

† In loc. Hom. 7. [vol. 3. p. 940. Par. 1740.]

‡ Contempl. of Life, &c.

Origen speaks very honourably of the blessed Virgin ; but yet he represents her as an instance of human frailty ; and one that needed forgiveness of sins, as well as the Apostles ; and that because she was offended, as he (it seems) was persuaded, at the passion of Christ. "What," says he, "do we think that when the Apostles were scandalized, the mother of our Lord was free from it ?" And so he interprets those words, "A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also," by this paraphrase, "the sword of unbelief shall pierce thy own soul, and thou shalt be smitten with the edge of doubtfulness." I doubt it will not be convenient to inquire of Origen any further.

As for Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, St. Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, they have left us nothing at all concerning her ; unless St. Cyprian says, somewhere, that "Christ was conceived in the womb of a virgin," &c. But if that be all, I am sure he neglected some very inviting occasions of putting his people in mind of a great deal more ; which he ought not to have neglected, if the doctrine of the Primitive Church concerning the blessed Virgin had been the same with that of the pretended Catholic Church at this day.

And so we are gotten out of the three first ages. But perhaps Athanasius makes amends for all that were before him, in the sermon upon the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin. That sermon, I confess, is a very surprising thing to any man, that considers there was not the least preparation for the doctrine it would pretend to establish, in the foregoing ages. But then this (as well as many other things that go under the name of Athanasius) is none of his ; as Bellarmine, and others of his party (obliged by the strength of truth) have actually confessed : and in all probability, it was written no less than 348 years after his death. In his genuine works there is more frequent mention of the Virgin, than in the Fathers before him ; especially in his Orations against the Arians, which he wrote about the year 360. But we must go further down, to find where her worship began, for as yet there is no appearance of it.

Hilary, who wrote about the same time, says nothing new in this matter.* He does industriously assert the virginity of Mary, which, and the like things, were done by some of those that went before him. But of her worship not a word.

To conclude ; the Fathers do generally speak of her without

* Hilar. Pictav. Com. in Matth. p. 497. [vol. 1. p. 670. Veron. 1730.]

the addition of any title of honour: for the most part they call her Mary; sometimes the Virgin; the Mother of our Lord rarely, and the Mother of God never, I think, till the Church was obliged to guard the belief of the divine nature of Christ, by all kind of proper expressions: and even then, this honourable appellation was used not for her sake, but to secure the right faith of our Lord's divinity, especially against the Nestorian heresy. In short, the Protestants do customarily mention the Virgin mother with honourable additions, beyond what the Fathers of the three first ages did. But we worship her just as they did, that is, not at all. For my own part, when I consider that she had the glorious privilege to be the Mother of God, I should have much ado to forbear regretting the little regard wherewith some of the Fathers speak of her sometimes, but that I find our Saviour himself, in those three sayings concerning her,* which are reported in the Gospels, not to magnify her over greatly. And the truth is, I should have wondered at that too, had not the excess of later devotion to her, put me in mind, that the holy writers were guided by a spirit of prophecy,† and have therefore recorded nothing that Christ said to his most holy mother, but what might be of use in such times as these.

§. 8. Let us now see, whether the religion of praying to martyrs and saints, and worshipping their images and relics has the authority of the primitive Church and all antiquity. It may very well be presumed, that it has not, unless we think that the Fathers preferred the other saints before the blessed Virgin. But to say the truth; though hitherto the Virgin and the rest of the saints were equal, as to any religious worship, neither she nor they being yet thought of for that purpose; yet when superstition at length began to creep into the Church, the martyrs got the start of the Virgin. In process of time, her worship overtopped theirs; but theirs began before her turn came. The most holy religion of the Gospel was delivered all at once; and which is most considerable, it is the religion which God hath sealed, and so it was, and is all of a piece. But the corruption of that religion coming on by degrees, as contingent occasions gave birth and growth to it, could not be regularly contrived, but would need a great deal of patching and mending, to bring it to a face of uniformity.

* Luke ii. 49. xi. 27, 28. John ii. 4.

† Rev. xix. 10.

As for praying to saints, I know not how any man can imagine, that the primitive Fathers taught or used it, who considers in what terms they taught, that God only was to be invoked: that they counted the worship of invocation a better sacrifice than those which had been offered to God, as the law of Moses required, and which all acknowledge were to be offered to God only; and that they argued the divinity of Christ from hence, that prayers were to be offered to him.

Irenæus tells us, that "the Church did nothing by invocations of angels, or incantations to them, or any other evil curiosity." Fevardentius pretends, that this excludes evil spirits only from being invoked. But let any unprejudiced man judge by what follows. "But," says he,* "she directs her prayers chastely, purely, and manifestly, to the Lord that made all things." Now according to Fevardentius, he should have added, "and to good spirits also." For it is a vain thing to say that he intended to oppose those only that worshipped malicious spirits; since if this had been his intention, the plain laws of discourse had obliged him rather to omit the worship of God in this opposition, than the worship of good spirits. And doubtless upon this supposition he would have said, that "we do not use prayers and hymns to evil, but to good spirits."

I cannot but set down here the words of the Church of Smyrna, in their golden epistle concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp. It seems the Jews had suggested, that if the Christians could gain his body, they would perhaps forsake Christ, and worship him (their love and reverence of that holy man, their bishop, was so well known). Against which suggestions, the Smyrnians thus declare themselves: "These men know not that we can neither forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all that are saved, the innocent for the guilty; nor worship any other. Him truly being the Son of God, we adore: but the martyrs, and disciples, and followers of the Lord, we justly love, for that extraordinary good mind, which they have expressed towards their King and Master; of whose happiness God grant that we may partake, and that we may learn by their examples." This testimony of the Church of Smyrna, I rather produce in this place; because in two ancient manuscripts, cited by the most learned Archbishop Usher, the Latin translation of their protestation runs thus: "We

* Iren. Lib. 2. c. 57. [ut supra, p. 166.]

Christians can never forsake Christ, who vouchsafed to suffer so great things for our sins, nor give away the worship of prayer to any other.”*

Clemens Alexandrinus defines prayer by its relation to God, in which (as Bellarmine† acknowledges) he was followed by divers Fathers in the fourth century. But nothing can be more plain, than this passage of his: “Since there is but one good God, both we and angels pray to‡ him alone; that those good things may be given us, which we want, and those continued which we have.” If half so plain a testimony could have been produced out of the genuine writings of these Fathers, for praying to others besides God, as these are for praying to God alone; I fear we should have been counted very impudent, in our appeals to the primitive Church, and the best antiquity. The same person had said not long before, “We do justly honour God by prayer, and with righteousness we send up this best and most holy sacrifice.”

And I find this to have been another general notion of the worship of prayer amongst the ancients, that it was a sacrifice much better than those more sensible sacrifices, that were either offered by the Gentiles, or required by the law of Moses; and more pleasing to God. Thus says Tertullian: “We sacrifice for the health and safety of the emperor, but we do it to our God, and his God; and we do it, as God hath commanded, with pure prayer,§ or purely with prayer:” For so he is to be understood, inasmuch as he opposeth the purity of prayer to the sacrifices of incense and victims:|| and therefore, says he, “we pray rather for the health of the emperor, desiring it of him who can give it.” This smart writer did, in his own way, very plainly represent our doctrine in the forementioned saying. “We sacrifice,” says he, “but to our God, and his God.” There he represents sacrifice, as due to God only: “But we do it, as God hath commanded, with pure prayer.” There he represents prayer as a sacrifice more excellent than that of odours and blood, which the Gentiles offered. And can any thing be more evident, than that he appropriates this sacrifice so to God, that it ought not to be given to any else? Thus also he proves against the Jews, that “we must now sacrifice

* See Act. Usser. Polic. or Answ. to the Jesuit's Challenge, Praying to Saints.

† Ὁμιλία πρὸς τὸν θεόν. [ut supra, p. 854.]

‡ Παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνου. Strom. l. 7. p. 721. [Ibid. p. 853.]

§ Pura prece. || Odoris aut sanguinis. Tert. ad Scap. 2. [ut supra, p. 69.]

to God, not earthly, but spiritual sacrifices; for it is written, a contrite and an humble heart is a sacrifice to God;”* and elsewhere, “offer the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the Most High.” And therefore, a little after, he affirms Christ to be “the high priest of eternal sacrifices,” in opposition to those that are abolished. Nay, he says that the pure offering† foretold in Malachi, which all nations should bring, is the “simplicity of prayer from the pure conscience,” which he elsewhere describes by blessing, and praise, and hymns; and so is the same with pure prayer mentioned before. This is enough to shew, that in his days the Church would no more have offered invocations of prayer or praise to any but to God, than they would have offered victims to any but to him, if they had been continued in the service of the Church.

And by this we may see, in what sort we are to understand that offering for the martyrs which we read of in Tertullian and St. Cyprian.‡ Says Tertullian, “We make oblations for them that are departed, in memory of their birth-days,” *i. e.* of the days wherein they were crowned with martyrdom. And thus St. Cyprian, writing to the Church of Carthage concerning Celerinus, and making mention of his uncles Laurentius and Ignatius, says,§ “We offer sacrifice for them, you may remember, as often as we celebrate the days upon which the martyrs suffered, with an anniversary commemoration.” And thus he writes to the clergy of Carthage, concerning the confessors, that should die in prison.|| “Note down the days of their death, that we may celebrate the commemorations amongst the memories of the saints,” &c. The meaning of which is, that they gave thanks and offered praises to God for those holy persons by name, who had constantly suffered death for the faith of Christ. These were the sacrifices they offered for the martyrs, the sacrifices of praise; not excluding what, by other authorities, is evident enough, the sacrifice of prayers for them too, and for all the departed saints, that they might at length obtain the promised resurrection. I do not say that the worship of Christians consisted only of these sacrifices: they had the oblation of bread and wine besides, ¶

* Ad. Jud. c. 5. [ut supra, p. 188.]

† Simplex oratio: Adv. Marci. [lib. 4.] c. 1. [Ibid. p. 414.]

‡ De Corona, c. 3. [Ibid. p. 102.] De Exhort. c. 13. Demen.

§ Cypr. Epist. 34. Rig. [p. 109. Venet. 1728.]

|| Id. Epist. 37. [Ibid. p. 115.]

¶ See Mr Mede upon Mincha purum.

before the eucharist ; and the representative sacrifice of our Lord's body and blood in the eucharist. It is enough, that the religious invocations of the Church were held to be the worship of sacrifice, and that of * a more excellent kind, than the earthly sacrifices of Jews and Gentiles, as Tertullian calls them. And let the pretended Catholics tell us, to whom the worship of sacrifice should be offered, but to God. They have, I confess, kept the style of the ancient Church, and pretend to sacrifice to God, and to him only. But the change which they have made in the doctrine and practice of the Church, hath obliged them to apply that style otherwise than the ancient Church did. When they speak of offering sacrifice, as M. de Meaux does in his † Exposition, we are, according to the use of that phrase in their writers, to understand nothing but the pretended sacrifice of the mass. But why must not the people be taught, that the worship of prayers and hymns is a sacrifice too ? For this was the current doctrine of the primitive Church. There is a good reason for it, because they do not pay this worship to God alone, as the primitive Church did.

And now, as for those passages concerning ‡ oblations and sacrifices already produced, and many more to the like purpose, that might be produced out of the Fathers ; I do not know how far a willing mind might go, to apply them to the sacrifice of the mass. And when that is done, it is but a little straining more, and they will interpret Gregory Nazianzen to their own mind too ; who in his funeral oration upon St. Basil, thus speaks of him. “ And now he is in heaven, § as I think, he offers sacrifices for us, and prayers for the people.” But I am confident Nazianzen did not so much as think that Basil said mass in heaven for him and the people.

To proceed, Origen is as express to this purpose as his master Clemens Alexandrinus. He saith, “ We must pray to him || alone, that is God over all, and we must pray to the Word of God, his only begotten, and the first-born of every creature ; and we must humbly beseech him, as our high priest, to present our prayer (for it is known to him) to his

* *Sacrificiorum officia potiora.* Adv. Marc. [Lib. 4. c. 1. Ibid. p. 413.]

† Exp. § 3, 4.

‡ See Constit. Apostol. lib. 7. c. 3.

§ *ὡς οἶμαι, προσφέρων θυσίας.*

|| *Μόνῳ γὰρ προσευκτίον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ.* Orig. contr. Cels. lib. 8. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 761.]

Father, and the Father of them that live according to the Word of God."

This is enough for one man to say, in so plain a case : and yet I will add what he says about this matter, from another common argument, *viz.* that the Divinity of Christ is clearly gathered from our making prayers to him. For upon those words of the Apostle, "With all that call upon the name of the Lord Jesus," he saith,* "That the Apostle pronounces Jesus Christ to be God, in that his name is called upon ;" and that "to call upon the name of the Lord, and to adore God, is one and the same thing." The reason of this, which I have ventured to offer, is, that prayer does ascribe omnipresence, as well as other divine perfections, to the being to which it is made. And this is that reason which Tertullian, as I think, hath expressed in these words :† "That faith offers its religion to him only ; of whom it is confident, that he sees and hears everywhere." For by religion he meant prayer, which is the subject of that discourse to which these words belong. Thus Novatian also : "If ‡ Christ be only a man, how is he everywhere present to those that call upon him ? since this is not the nature of man, but of God, to be present in all places!" And in the same place, "If Christ be only a man, why is a man invoked as a mediator in prayers ; since the invocation of man must be judged ineffectual for the procuring of salvation ?" And to name no more, Athanasius frequently uses this kind of argument. For speaking of prayers made to the Son of God, he says,§ "The saints think it not just to invoke him to be their helper and refuge, who was made or created. And no man would pray to receive any thing from the fathers and the angels, or from any of the other creatures : " from whence he concludes, that because the Apostle in 1 Thess. iii. 11, does not only pray to God the Father, but also to our Lord Jesus Christ ; that therefore Christ is God. It seems it was not then the way of Christians to join God and St. Michael, God and the Virgin, God and all the saints, in invocations or prayers. There were then no such things known, as confession to God and to St. Michael, and to the blessed Virgin, and to the saints ; as giving glory to the holy Trinity and to

* Orig. in Decim. ad Rom. lib. 8. [Ibid. vol. 4. p. 624. col. 2.]

† Tert. de Orat. cap. 1. [ut supra, p. 130.]

‡ Nov. de Trin. c. 14. [Apud Tert. p. 715. Par. 1695.]

§ Athan. Orat. contra Arian. 2. 4.

the Virgin; as saying, "Jesus, Mary, help," &c. had any thing of this nature been done in those times, I doubt here had been a good argument lost, by which the Fathers proved Christ to be God. Nor would Athanasius have been so mere a child, as to attack the Arians with an argument, to which the doctrine and practice of the Church had afforded so obvious and effectual an answer.

To all which I shall add but that canon of the Laodicean Synod,* "That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside, and invoke angels: therefore if any man be found using this secret idolatry, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ." I make no question, but if there had been occasion, saints had been put into the canon as well as angels. But then, what word could they have thought of, instead of saints, to answer 'corners,' (*angulos*) which Crab thrust into the old Latin translation, instead of 'angels' (*angelos*) is not very easy to imagine. Concerning which pleasant forgery, see Bishop Usher's Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 469, &c.

And now if we consider the doctrine of these primitive Fathers concerning prayer, I suppose we shall not wonder, that in those places where we might well have expected some instance of praying to saints, or some recommendation of it, (if any such practice had been amongst them) that I say there is nothing at all, no not the least intimation of it: not where St. Cyprian† so vehemently admonished those that were fallen in persecution, to pray to God for themselves, and to entreat the brethren to do so too: not where ‡ Tertullian describes the humiliations and prostrations of the penitents; in both which places, one would have expected, that the intercession of the saints and martyrs should have been implored: not where Justin Martyr describes the service of the Church in her religious assemblies; nor in any of the ancient Apologies, nor in any ancient account of the religious worship of Christians; no not in the § Apostolical Constitutions (though a later work than it pretends to be), where the order of the Church's service is very particularly described. We are not

* Synod. Laod. cap. 35. [can. 35.] [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 1503. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† Cypr. de Laps. p. 177.

‡ Tert. de Pœnitentia, c. 9. [ut supra, p. 127.]

§ Apost. Constit. lib. 7, 8. [Labbe, Conc. ut supra, p. 413, &c.]

to wonder at it, I say, for the declared doctrine of the Church was against it.

§. 9. As for the worshipping, or as M. de Meaux calls it, the honouring, of images, we might spare the pains of inquiring what the sense of the ancient Church was concerning it; it is so hard to believe that they should worship the images of the saints, who did not so much as pray, or give any religious worship to the saints themselves. But this practice is so far from having the countenance of the primitive Church, and all antiquity, that in the best ages there were men of great name in the Church, that did not believe so much as the art of imagery and picture lawful to be practised by a Christian. Saith Clemens Alexandrinus,* “We are plainly forbidden to meddle with that cheating art: for the Prophet (Moses) saith, thou shalt not make the likeness of any thing either in heaven or in earth.” Tertullian hath a great deal to this purpose, in his discourse of Idolatry. But those words are, to my thinking, very remarkable:† “Well did the same God require the likeness of a serpent to be made by an extraordinary command, who by his law forbade the making of any likeness. If thou observest the same God, thou hast his law: make no likeness. If also thou lookest to the precept of making an image afterward, do thou also imitate Moses: make no image whatsoever against the law, unless God also command thee in particular so to do.” Which words are so plain and full, that they leave no room for that frivolous pretence, that these Fathers intended no other images, but those of the heathen gods. And that instance of the brazen serpent which was no idol till the Jews made it one, clearly shews the contrary.

But if it be said, that the authority of these men is to go for nothing, because they were mistaken in condemning image-work so universally as they did; I grant, that their zeal against image worship transported them beyond the bounds of reason; especially Tertullian, who in the foresaid book, tells us, that ‡ “artificers of statues and images, and all carved and engraven works of this kind, were brought into the world by the devil.” But this I say, that if images had in those days been used in Christian churches, so much as to excite the devotion of the

* Protrept. ad Gentes

† Tert. de Idol. c. 5, 6. [ut supra, p. 88.]

‡ Ibid. c. 2 [c. 3] [p. 86.]

faithful, much more to receive their adoration; neither would these Fathers have condemned the making of images, nor, if they had, would the Church have borne with so great an outrage upon their doctrine and practice. Some one at least would have appeared in behalf of the Catholic Church, as Melchior Canus has done in behalf of the Roman Church against the Eliberine Council in this matter; who sticks not to say, that* “their law for taking away images was not only imprudently, but impiously established.” The censure which he so long after passed upon that Council, had been fastened upon these men presently, by more than one, as good as Canus, if image worship had but been allowed then, as it is now established in the Roman communion. They were not so tame as to suffer their worship to be affronted by their own members, without taking notice of it. But the truth is, the monuments of the ancient† Church afford us no accounts of images any where, but either in libraries, or‡ at a house door, or in the holes of heretics, or in the temples of false gods. We read indeed of one picture of Christ, or some saint, which Epiphanius found in a curtain of the Church of Anablatha; but he took it down, and tore it in pieces. Such accounts as this are not for the credit of image-worship; which indeed came into the Church at the tail of other corruptions. And the Fathers are so unanimous and positive against it, that I will shut up this matter with the testimony of a great many Fathers in one testimony, *viz.* that of the Eliberine Council held about the beginning of the fourth age.§ “It is our pleasure, that pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored, should be painted upon walls.”

As for the relics of saints and martyrs, we hear of none for the three first ages, but that of bodies, nor any thing concerning them, but that they were interred with all possible respect that could be expected from men, and which is more, from Christians. The honour, which, by the custom of the world, we learn is proper to the bodies of the dead, is to give them a decent interment. This was maintained and cherished

* Canus, *Loc. Theol.* l. 5. c. 4. [p. 251. Colon. 1606.]

† Euseb. *Hist. lib.* 7. c. 18. [p. 265. Par. 1659.] Iren. l. 1. c. 24. [ut supra, p. 105.]

‡ Concerning the Image of the Syrophenician Woman, &c. See Dr. Stillingfleet against T. G. p. 253.

§ Concil. Elib. Can. 36. [Labbe, *Concil. ut supra*, p. 974.]

by the ancient Christians,* not only because reasonable souls once lived in those bodies which they committed to the ground, which was an inducement common to man; but because also those bodies and souls were to be once again joined at the resurrection, which was an inducement proper to Christians. It was the same kind of honour which they shewed to the bodies of martyrs, though heightened with the expressions of a more than ordinary love. Thus, after the martyrdom of St. Stephen, devout men carried him out to be buried,† and made great lamentation over him.

The like account did the Smyrneans give of their disposing the bones of Polycarp, which they reckoned more valuable than precious stones, more precious than gold. M. de Meaux sure would not desire a farther progression of love and honour. But with this degree they contented themselves; for, say they, “We committed them to burial where it was usual.”‡

And thus Pius, the first of that name, bishop of Rome:§ “Take care,” saith he, “of the bodies of the holy martyrs, as of God’s members, after that manner that the Apostles took care of Stephen’s.”

Thus the clergy of Rome, in their epistle to the clergy of Carthage, when St. Cyprian was absent: “to speak of a matter of very great consequence. If the bodies of martyrs or others be not buried, it is a very dangerous fault in those that are to look after this business.” So that in those days it should seem to be a charge entrusted to select persons, that the bodies of martyrs and other Christians should be buried; and this not only at Carthage, but at Rome too.

But why should I multiply testimonies in so plain a case? Had the relics of martyrs and saints been worshipped in those best times, as they were afterward, how comes it to pass, that in all the monuments of those times, no mention of any such thing is to be found? When the trade of relics began in the Church, there was noise enough made of it, and the best authors acquaint us with the news: but it had been no news, if the trade had been begun before. Why was no such thing

* Orig. contra Cels. lib. 5. Tertul. de Anima.

† Συνεκρίμισαν. Acts viii. [2.]

‡ Ὅσα αὐτοῦ ἀπεδέμεθα, ὁποῦ καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν. Sm. Epist. supr. [Biblioth. Patr. Apost. p. 412. Lips. 1699.]

§ Cura, quemadmodum curaverunt. Curare here, is the same with κηδεσθαι, κηδεῖν. Pius Epist. 2. tom. 1. Con. [p. 577.] See Cypr. Ep. 37. [ut supra, p. 114.] Cypr. Epist. 2. [Ibid. p. 27.]

objected to the Christians, by their watchful enemies, for three hundred years together? For we no sooner come to hear of stories of relics in the Church, but we find the Pagans at the heels of this innovation, and upbraiding the Christians with the superstition of it. Why meet we not with some intimation of laying up relics in churches under the altar? There was room enough for so considerable and necessary a circumstance (and the Church of Rome makes more than a circumstance of it), in that particular description of the fashion and ornaments of the church built by Paulinus, bishop of Tyre.* Why meet we with no translations of bodies from one place to another, for their greater honour? Perhaps we shall be told of the men from the East, that came to Rome, and challenged the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul, as of right belonging to them; and of their carrying them two miles out of town, to a place called Catacumbæ, and all the other adventures that Gregory tells upon this business. But then there will arise a great question, whether we are to believe with Gregory,† that they were Eastern believers; or, with Baronius,‡ that they were thievish Greeks? Or rather it will be no question, that the whole relation is fabulous from one end to the other.

In short, why have we all this time no account of miracles wrought by relics, of carrying them about in processions, of exposing them to receive the adorations of the people, of wearing them as a special security against spiritual and temporal evils, or of any instance of this kind of religion? I answer, it is a fond thing to imagine, that the religion of worshipping the relics of the saints should be in use amongst them, who gave no religious worship to the saints themselves.

But it is not to be wondered at, that they who pray to the souls of the saints and martyrs, who are so far absent from us, that they hear us not, should be guilty of another weakness, and worship their bones, and other relics, which neither hear nor see, though they are present.

This account of the sentiments of the three first ages, and indeed of the better half of the fourth, we gather from the writings of the Fathers, and from the undoubted monuments of those times. Monsieur de Meaux knew, that these things had been diligently expounded by those of the Reformation, and

* Euseb. Hist. lib. 20. [10.] c. 4 [ut supra, p. 371.]

† Greg. lib. 3. Ep. 30.

‡ Baron. A.D. 221. N. 4. [vol. 2. p. 462. col. 1. Luc. 1738.]

particularly by M. Daille. And what does he oppose to this, to save his pretences to all antiquity harmless? Says he,* “Without any further examination what might be the sentiments of the Fathers of the three first ages, I will content myself with what M. Daille is pleased to grant, who allows us so many great men, who taught the Church in the fourth age.” Now M. Daille neither made any such allowance, nor had he any reason to make it. But suppose he had, must all that he had written concerning the sense of the three first ages, about the object of worship, go for nothing? If this example of writing is fit to be followed, I know not why I should give myself any farther trouble, and not rather conclude thus: that† “without any farther examination what may be the sentiments of the Fathers of the following age, I shall content myself with what some great men of the Roman Church are pleased to grant, and which is evidently proved against all the rest that deny it, *viz.* that the Fathers of the three first ages must be allowed to us.” And so leave it to the world to judge who has most reason to be content.

§. 10. But having undertaken to give some account of the beginnings of the present superstitions of the Church of Rome, in the matter of saint-worship, and the adoration of the images and relics of the saints: and because it is impossible to do this, without going beyond the first ages, till we come to the reign of Julian; I must venture beyond him, and consider the state of the Church toward the latter end of the fourth century, with respect to these questions. Some of the Romanists pretend that antiquity to be on their side, which I have shewn is with us. But as far as I can perceive, they all pretend to be very confident they shall carry it thus high at least; and M. de Meaux takes it for granted, that we begin to allow them those later Fathers. I shall endeavour to represent the case as impartially as if I were yet to choose my opinion; and I am very much mistaken, if it will not appear in conclusion (though there is a little more colour for their challenging the latter end of the fourth age, in favour of their doctrine and practices in these things, than for appealing to higher antiquity), that upon a true consideration of the grounds upon which they challenge these later Fathers as their own, it had been more advisable for them to have come down much lower to find precedents whereby to justify them-

* Exp. [ut supra] p. 4.

† Peresius de Tradition. Par. 3, &c.

selves. It had been a very ancient custom of the Church for Christians to meet at the cemeteries, or burying-places of the martyrs, and the rest of the faithful, there to celebrate anniversary commemorations of the martyrs. Thus the Church of Smyrna* having intimated that they had buried the body of St. Polycarp in the usual place, they added, "that in that place, God willing, they should assemble together to celebrate the birth-day of his martyrdom, with all the joy they could express:" and the reason of this custom, they express in this manner: "both to commemorate those who had already undergone the trial of martyrdom, and to exercise and to prepare those that were to follow, for the like conflicts." But they did not meet here to celebrate the memories of the martyrs only, but at other times also for the celebration of divine service. For we find that Valerian and Gallien† forbade the Christians to celebrate assemblies, or to meet at those places which they called cemeteries; which passages, and the like, imply, that it was ordinary for them to assemble there: and it is not improbable that they used those places for more privacy, when there was danger of persecution; and that the prohibition of assemblies in those cemeteries, was the utmost strictness of prohibiting their assemblies: for it is plain, that they had their churches besides in cities, which they built and repaired according to their ability. And so in that favourable time between Gallien and Diocletian,‡ we find that they added new churches in every city, to those which they had before. But whether they were wont to meet at the cemeteries (at other times besides the anniversary days of the martyrs) for privacy, or perhaps for the commodiousness of those places, when they did not consult privacy, as some think; or whether it was out of special respect to the memories of those martyrs, I shall not need to dispute; for it is a clear case, that they fervently loved those excellent men and women, and honoured their memories, who had laid down their lives for the testimony of Jesus. This was one reason of celebrating their anniversary commemorations, in which they did what highly became them, and carefully kept themselves within this compass, that religious worship was to be given to God only.

But when, under Constantine the Great, the profession of Christianity was not only safe, but the way to honour and

* Ep. Smyr. ubi supra.

† Euseb. Hist. lib. 7. c. 11. [ut supra, p. 258.]

‡ Id. lib. 8. c. 1. [Ibid. p. 292.]

greatness, the memories of the saints more frequented than they had formerly been, and stately churches were built over their sepulchres; and the Emperor, the clergy, and the people seemed to vie with one another, who should express the greatest zeal in carrying on so pious a work; which extraordinary fervour, considering the time, was not to be wondered at: for the Church was but now delivered not only out of a raging persecution, but from the apprehension of any more, and therefore could not but reflect upon the martyrs with all tenderness of affection. And since they were not now alive to partake in the prosperous and triumphant state of the Church, it was natural to give their names and memories all that share in it, which was possible to be given; especially since the present peace and glory of the Church was, under God, so deeply owing to the noble examples of their fortitude and patience. The commemorations of the martyrs had formerly a double end, to do honour, and express a dear affection to them; and withal, to prepare and to excite the virtue of those that were to suffer afterward; which latter end, without all doubt, was the most necessary: but there being now so little occasion for that, the piety of these prosperous times ran out more plentifully in doing honours to those champions of Christ, that had borne the heat of the day, and left this age to enjoy that victory and sweet peace, wherewith God had now crowned his persecuted Church.

And as this zeal was no more than what might be expected from human affection, raised by Christian piety; so if men could have told where to stop, it had been as much for the honour of Christianity, as the excesses to which it grew afterwards, were a disgrace to it.

From Constantine's coming to the empire, to the reign of Julian, there passed above fifty years; and, in this time, the reverence of the martyrs was grown to some excess beyond primitive examples: for it was not only thought reasonable to build churches over the sepulchres, but it should seem there were many that thought their prayers would speed the better for being made over the tombs of the martyrs; and not content with this, they began at length to search for their bones: and it grew to be the piety of this age to disturb the ashes of the dead, which it was the piety of the former ages to leave in their graves without disturbance. But as yet their prayers were directed to God only; we have yet no examples of calling upon saints and martyrs. Julian himself, who aggravated the

respect shewn to the martyrs to the utmost, could not charge them with this; and he very well understood their practice. But, says he,* "since Jesus has said, that sepulchres are full of uncleanness, why do you call upon God over sepulchres?" It is true he also charged them with worshipping the martyrs, and upbraided them, that having forsaken the religious rites of the Gentiles, they had gone over to the Jews, and yet had not kept to their religion neither, which had been something. For, "then," says he,† "you would have worshipped one God instead of many, and not one man (Jesus), or rather many miserable men;" meaning the martyrs. But this was only a spiteful construction of the custom of Christians, in paying their devotions to God over the sepulchres of the martyrs.

Not long after Julian comes Eunapius, a most bitter wretch; by whose censures we may easily observe, that the devotion of Christians towards the martyrs was still growing to a greater height. I perceive he is cited both by Protestants and Papists; by Protestants, to shew the beginnings of that superstition we complain of; by Papists, to shew that the invocation of saints, and the worship of relics, was at least so ancient. This infidel, speaking of monks (a sort of men which this age first brought forth) says, that they‡ "heaped together bones and skulls of men that had been punished for many crimes, holding them for gods; and prostrating themselves before such as had been chastised by order of the courts of justice; and believing the better of themselves for being polluted at their sepulchres. So that they who were but mere slaves, and those none of the best, but soundly lashed, and carrying still the scars and marks of their villany in their very ghosts, are now called martyrs, and made the ministers and messengers of prayer to the gods." Thus did the base villain reproach the blessed martyrs of Jesus, in contempt of the monks, and indeed of all the Christians in those times. For though it should seem that the trade of relics was chiefly driven by the monks; yet it is evident, that great account was made of relics in almost all places; which, together with daily resort of devout Christians to the memories of the martyrs, gave occasion to this infidel thus to upbraid them: for no man will believe all to be true, which he here charges even the monks with. A malicious enemy always says the

* Apud Cyril. l. 10. contra Julian. p. 335. [Lut. Par. 1638.]

† Id. lib. 6. p. 201.

‡ Eunapius in vita *Ædesii*.

worst that he has any colour or pretence to say : and if such occasions and pretences had been afforded by the ancient Christians, as by these, we should certainly have heard the same objections from Lucian or Celsus, or some one Pagan writer of those times, who were as able, as spiteful, and vigilant adversaries as Julian and Eunapius.

But whereas Eunapius pretended, that these monks called the martyrs, “ ministers and messengers of their prayers ;” he might possibly have no other reason for it, but the common observation, that Christians went to the sepulchres of the saints, there to make their prayers. For although they directly applied themselves to none but God, when they were there ; yet the choosing of those places for their devotions, especially with a profession of hoping to speed the better for so doing, was occasion enough to Eunapius to say, that they made the martyrs, “ the ministers and messengers of their prayers.” But for ought any man can tell, Eunapius might come to understand that these monks did, what I question not was the custom of some Christians towards the latter end of this age ; that is, that they called to the martyrs at their memories, as if they were present there ; of which I shall give a farther account in its proper place. It is certain, that many miracles were said to be done upon prayers made where the relics of the martyrs were ; that is, at their memories.

And some thereupon believed, that they were done at their intercession, and joining their own prayers with the prayers of the Christians that came thither. In which they were more confirmed by some confident reporters of visions and apparitions of the martyrs* to those that had obtained their suits. Now of those who believed the martyrs were within hearing, it is very likely that some called to them with an *ora pro nobis* ; and then no wonder that Eunapius charged the monks with raking for dead men’s bones, and making dead men the messengers of their prayers.

As for the miracles said to be done in those times, they are urged by the Romanists as an invincible argument of God’s approving the honour that was given to the saints and their relics, in that age of the Church. But I wish they would attend to what St. Augustine says, who, after a pretty large account of miracles that were wrought in his time, and some too at the memories of martyrs, plainly says, that whether

* Aug. de Cura pro Mortuis, c. 16. [vol. 6. p. 528. Par. 1685-7.]

they were wrought by the ministry of martyrs or angels (for that he knew not), they were wrought to give testimony to that faith,* for which the martyrs died; and particularly to the resurrection of Christ, and to our resurrection at the last day. There is no reason to suppose that every circumstance of the devotion of Christians that received miraculous relief, must be attested by those miracles which God wrought in farther confirmation of the truth of Christianity. God has made use even of wicked men for the working of miracles; and I cannot understand why a miracle may not be wrought in behalf of a sincere man, without approving his weakness, any more than the other's wickedness is approved by God's making use of him to testify the truth. But I would be content to let them use this argument for miracles without contradiction, if they would extend it no farther than in favour of that use of relics, which we yet meet with. In the fourth age they ransacked all places for them, and when, as they thought, they had got them, they put them in fine linen, or in curious boxes and repositories, and laid them up in the Church. But whatever good they expected from these treasures, they did not yet worship them; they did not incense them, and expose them to receive the adorations of the people. Vigilantius, it seems, had asked, with some derision, "Why dost thou kiss and adore a little dust put up in fine linen?" To which St. Jerome,† that went as high as any in the age for honouring relics, answered, "Who, O thou giddy-brained man, ever adored the martyrs? Who has taken a man for God?" Indeed St. Jerome thought that holy relics made the very devils roar with pain; but yet he did not think that they were to be adored,‡ no not the martyrs themselves, but God only. We could wish that all superstition were banished from amongst Christians; but if the Church of Rome would be content with such things as St. Jerome§ blames in some "silly men and religious women, that had a zeal, but not according to knowledge, viz. burning wax candles by day light, in honour of martyrs," we would be content too; for these are tolerable faults, and such as should not break the peace, though they were better mended. I would say to any contentious man, what St. Jerome|| said to Vigilantius, "What dost thou lose by it," if others are a little foolish?

* Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 22. c. 9. [Ibid. vol. 7. p. 673.]

† Hieron. adv. Vigil. tom. 2. p. 155. [vol. 2. p. 391, 397. Veron. 1735.]

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

I confess, I should beg of these gentlemen, for the honour of our religion, and of the testimony of miracles, not to pretend the miracles of the fourth and fifth ages, as a testimony to every punctilio of honour done in those times to the relics of the saints, and to the opinion which some conceived of them. And as I said before, it would be more discreetly done to let those miracles go, as St. Austin did, for a notable confirmation of the truth of that religion for which those martyrs died, by whose dead bodies God was pleased to do some wonderful things. But it is by no means advisable to stretch them in favour of some other things; whereof the lighting of candles for the martyrs may go for one, and the unwillingness of some of them to build churches, unless they could get relics to lay there, for another; and the scattering of relics in little pieces up and down, may pass for a third; and stealing them, for a fourth; which, I know not how, came to be excused at least, as an effect of great and religious zeal, by some men of no mean note. I do not think such things as these are very easy to be defended; and therefore it were much better that miracles were not brought in to justify them. But least of all should they be urged in favour of that kind of worship, which the Church of Rome now gives them; and not only to the bodies, bones, or ashes, but to the girdles, slippers, and little utensils of the saints and martyrs; which kind of things anciently were not thought of. God wrought miracles by the hands of St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, when they were alive. Now if we had their bones, or some pieces of them, and God should be pleased to work miracles by them still, there would be, I am confident, no more reason upon this account to give their relics any religious worship, now the Apostles are dead, than there was to worship the Apostles themselves upon the same account, when they were alive. Moreover, God wrought miracles by the Brazen Serpent; and yet when the people had fallen to burn incense to it, it was broken to pieces, to his great honour, who opposed a zeal with knowledge, to the blind zeal of the people.

But to deal freely, I am not fully satisfied that these miracles, by the bodies of saints and martyrs, were half so frequent as the noise that was made of them in this age, or in the next, would make us believe. I more than fear, that those times were too credulous, or that the writings of those Fathers have met with more foul play than has been yet discovered, though no small discoveries of that kind have been made since

the Reformation. It is some prejudice against the credibility of those relations, that in the three first ages we hear nothing of miracles wrought by relics ; which we are not to wonder at, because they lay quiet in their graves ; and the ancient Church was so little concerned in this religion of relics, that the bodies of martyrs that suffered under Diocletian and Licinius,* that is, at the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth age, lay undiscovered, till chance or pretended revelations brought them to light ; which is a manifest argument, that the ancient Church knew nothing of these matters, and that they had their beginning in the declension of the fourth age. Again, if the bodies of martyrs ordinarily discovered themselves by a gift of miracles, I wonder how it came to be so ordinary a thing to counterfeit relics, as it was. For who would dare to put off the bones of a malefactor, for the bones of a martyr, if it was known that true relics would distinguish themselves from false, by true miracles ? And yet St. Austin himself complains of a multitude of cheating fellows in his time,† “that were scattered up and down in the habit of monks, wandering about from province to province, sent no whither, fixed no where, staying no where ; some of which professed the trade of selling the bones of martyrs, if you will believe they were martyrs’ bones.” It would require a volume to shew the boldness that was taken in after times. God has given to a man but one head, and one pair of hands ; but the religion of relics has found more than one a-piece for many of the saints and martyrs : and when they all work miracles, I must needs believe that some of them are counterfeit miracles ; and if I can yet discern no difference, I would know why they should not all go for counterfeit. For when God works miracles, they are too plain, for the most part, to be denied, even by those whose interest it is to deny them.

But when I consider St. Chrysostom’s judgment in the case, I must confess myself to be under a mighty prejudice against the credibility of most relations of this sort that went in that age. I well remember that he somewhere gives express caution against listening after miracles : but in one place, never to be forgotten, very pertinent to the occasion of his discourse, he argues in this manner :‡ “Because now there are

* Ambros. de Exhort. ad Virg. [vol. 2. p. 277, &c. Par. 1690.] Sozom. lib. 9. c. 2. [p. 366. Cantab. 1720.]

† Aug. de Opere Monach. c. 28. [ut supra, vol. 6. p. 498.]

‡ Chrys. Hom. 6. in 1 Cor. ii. [vol. 10. p. 45, 46. Par. 1732.]

no miracles wrought, do not thou take this for an argument, that none were wrought THEN (in the Apostles' days): for then it was profitable that they should be wrought; but now it is profitable that they should not be wrought." But how, says he, "does it come to pass, that signs should be profitable then, and not so now?" Then he shews, that the continuance of miracles would lessen the rewardableness of faith; and "for this reason," says he, "they are not now wrought. And that is the truth, you may see by what our Lord said to Thomas: 'Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' By how much therefore a more convincing miracle is shewn, by so much is the praise and reward of faith lessened: wherefore, if now also miracles were done, the same inconvenience would follow." But for a farther answer, he adds, That although they had now no miracles, yet several predictions had been accomplished, which was a continued confirmation of the truth of Christianity; and moreover, that the good lives and examples of Christians were now more necessary for the conviction of unbelievers, than miracles: for, says he, "It is the want of primitive sanctity, rather than of miracles, which makes men still remain in their unbelief."

Which testimony of so judicious a man, is a plain argument that miracles were at least very rare in his time; and that every martyr's bones did not do the same wonders that Baby-las's bones were said to have done in Julian's time.

I may therefore be well excused, if I impute that noise of miracles, which was so loud in this and the next age, in great part to the credulity of the age, and to the difficulty of standing against that torrent of zeal for the honour of the martyrs, which had carried most men already beyond the bounds of antiquity.

What shall a man make of that story which St. Jerome tells of Hilarion's relics? How Hesychius, a holy man, ventured his life to steal the body of Hilarion the monk, out of the garden of Cyprus, where he was buried, to carry it to Palestine; and how Constantia took it so to heart, that she died upon it. For this religious woman was wont, it seems, to watch whole days and nights at his sepulchre; and for the helping of her prayers, to talk with him as if he was present.* I should think it is not much for the credit of religion, to represent a holy man plundering a grave, and a holy woman

* Hieron. de vita Hilarionis. tom. 1. p. 98. Colon. [ut supra, p. 40.]

breaking her heart for the loss of the body : but if we must believe the story, miracles followed the stolen body ; and yet they tarried in the place from whence it was stolen : so that Hesychius indeed, and they of Palestine, were considerable gainers ; but Constantia was not so great a loser as she thought. For thus the relation goes on : we see to this day a wonderful contention between those of Palestine and those of Cyprus ; one pretending to his body, the other to his spirit. And yet in both places there are great miracles done every day, but more in the garden of Cyprus, and that perhaps because he loved that place best.

If miracles were done in both places, I am pretty well satisfied that God did not thereby intend to demonstrate either the clearness of Hesychius, or the discretion of Constantia in this business, nor approve the violent passion of either of them for relics. I do not deny but they might both of them be holy persons, but it was not for such things as these ; and if this part of their story had been omitted, their reputation for sanctity had lost nothing by it. What therefore was it that God testified by these miracles ? I answer with all submission, that he testified the truth of that religion in which Hilarion died ; of that religion for which the martyrs died, the most holy religion which was first taught by Jesus, then by the Apostles, then by the primitive ages of Christianity after the Apostles ; not of any sentiments or practices, which neither the holy Jesus taught, nor his Apostles ; and which the primitive Church was a stranger to. This I am sure I have learned from St. Austin,* in the place before-mentioned, who makes the testimony of those miracles that were wrought at the memories of the martyrs, to aim at nothing but the confirmation of the faith for which they suffered. And if I should say, that they who can be content with the old religion, may and ought to be content also with the old miracles, I should say no other thing than what I could justify by his authority : and which is something more, that we are now to try doctrines not by new miracles, but by the Scriptures, which we are sure deliver to us the will of God testified by miracles. But if God is pleased to add new miracles, out of his abundant goodness, I do not doubt but such miracles are a confirmation of the old religion, as St. Austin† tells us

* Aug. de Unit. Eccles. c. 16.

† De Civitat. Dei, lib. 22. c. 9. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 673.]

those were, which God wrought at the memories of the martyrs. But those miracles did by no means canonize the weakness of any holy person, in the matter of martyrs or saints, and relics; not the indiscretion of Hesychius or Constantia; nor did they give any authority at all to such examples.

I suppose the gentlemen of the Church of Rome will grant this without any trouble; but I question whether they may not be displeased at the producing of this story, which, without any more ado, looks so like a satire upon the great author from whom I had it. But what a hard case is ours! Monsieur de Meaux, and the pretended Catholics, think to bear us down (who honour the relics of the saints no otherwise than the truly primitive Church did) by the authority of the later Fathers that lived towards the end of the fourth age. It has been often shewn, that the judgment and practice of that age, in the matter of relics, is very different from what we now see in the Church of Rome. But the argument is still urged upon us, as if nothing had been said to it. What have we therefore to do, but to shew, that so far as there is any agreement between the Church of Rome, and that age of the Church in the use of relics, they should urge it very modestly, and without boasting. We do profess a reverence for those excellent men, as M. de Meaux* grants; we acknowledge their sanctity and learning, and we praise God for the benefits which the Church hath received by their means. But we do not think their authority equal to that of the Apostles, or of the Fathers of the three first ages. And we are very sorry that the impertinency of our adversaries puts us upon a necessity of confessing, that these great men (as M. de Meaux deservedly calls them) did, in the heat of their concern for relics, sometimes say and do such little things, as plainly shewed they were but men. We had been very glad, if our English Romanists would not have done this part of the controversy into English, nor obliged us to take off that veil a little, wherewith we have covered the least commendable characters of these excellent men. Nay, we have that reverence for their sanctity and learning, that we are still very willing to believe their writings to have been corrupted in those places, which afford this kind of stories. And though St. Jerome affirms, that he wrote the life of Hilarion; yet I must confess, this is so weak a part

* Exp. p.

of it, which I have mentioned, that I am sometimes almost persuaded that somebody has been making bold to mend him. I am sure there appears such a spirit of superstition and credulity in these passages, at the end of St. Hilarion's life—of superstition in the persons spoken of, and of credulity in the relator—that St. Jerome is a great deal more beholden to them that cannot be satisfied they are his, than to those that can.

But to proceed: I have already observed that the affection of this age to the martyrs was expressed by a frequent and continual resort to their tombs or memories: and that when Christians obtained the deliverance or relief which they sought, it was believed to be in great part the effect of the martyrs' favour with God; which in many persons grew into a persuasion, that the martyrs were present at their* memories. And in this persuasion they were confirmed by apparitions, which were at least believed to be seen there, since it gave occasion to some questions then, and to a great controversy afterward, whether they were the souls of the martyrs, or whether they were angels that appeared.

But the great question is, whether in those applications to the memories of their martyrs, they called upon God only, or the martyrs also. For here it is that the pretended Catholics must find colour of thus much antiquity, if any where. For their appeals to the apostrophes of some of the Fathers in their panegyric orations upon the martyrs, deserve no consideration. If indeed the faithful were wont to call upon the martyrs at their memories; this has some appearance of an argument for the pretended Catholics.

I shall therefore first lay down the fact, remembering all along that it is the duty of an honest man to deliver things as they appear to him, and not to attempt the defence even of truth, but only with such arguments, as he is well satisfied of the truth of himself. But when the fact is stated, I shall not envy the best advantages that our adversaries can make of it.

That account which St. Austin† gives of the tailor that had lost his cloak, and went to the twenty martyrs to pray for another, has been often produced as a sufficient demonstration that the practice of that age was to call upon the martyrs themselves. But to this it is answered on the other

* Aug. de Cura pro Mortuis, c. 16. [Ibid. vol. 6. p. 528.]

† Ad viginti Martyres oravit.

side, that no more can be certainly concluded from hence, than that the tailor went to the memory of the twenty martyrs, and there prayed to God: as it is said of others, that they* went to the memory of St. Stephen, and there prayed that God would give them what they wanted; which is a defensible interpretation of such passages. For the application that was made to the martyrs by going to their memories or churches, and the hope of prevailing by their intercessions, did not necessarily imply any invocation of the martyrs: but the supplicant believing them to be present at their memories, and to observe the prayers that were made to God there, might hope for the benefit of their intercession, without speaking to them. As for St. Austin himself, what his opinion was concerning the presence of the martyrs, I shall shew in another place.

But some of St. Chrysostom's homilies are produced with no little assurance, to shew not only that the saints were invoked at their memories, but that he approved it too. And indeed St. Chrysostom's authority, in a doubtful manner, would bear a little boasting: that age did not afford a man superior to him in true judgment, perhaps not his equal. But then it is but a fair request, that those homilies be not obtruded upon us for his, of which it is very doubtful whether they be his or not: those, for instance, to the people of Antioch; the Greek copies whereof could not be found in any ancient library. I interpose this, not for the service of a cause, but for the honour of St. Chrysostom, than whom no man abounds more with exhortations to pray to God, upon such considerations as these: "Thou mayest always and incessantly call upon God, and shall meet with no difficulty; for there is no need of door-keepers to introduce thee, of stewards or procurators, of guards or friends; but when thou comest by thyself, then will he most of all hear thee, even when thou beseechest none else. We do not so effectually incline him, when we entreat by others, as when we do it by ourselves."† How this can be reconciled with two or three passages (which, if they be his, do manifestly imply his approbation of calling upon the martyrs at their memories), I cannot for my part understand; especially that in the con-

* Visum est ut iret ad memoriam S. Stephani, et illic quantum posset oraret, ut Deus illi daret. De Civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 668.]

† Chrys. in 4 Psal. [ut supra, vol. 5. p. 8, 9.]

clusion of the homily upon Bernix, &c. which I shall examine by and bye. For to avoid contention about a matter not necessary to the cause in hand, I will proceed upon that testimony, as if it were St. Chrysostom's. But whatever St. Chrysostom's opinion was concerning the thing itself, I think it cannot reasonably be denied, that we have his testimony that it was done: for describing the magnificence of the monuments of the saints, which were* "more splendid than the palaces of kings, not only for the greatness and beauty of their building, but which was more for the great resort of devout people thither;" he goes on thus: "for thither even he that is clothed with purple, goes to embrace their monuments, and laying by his stateliness, he stands entreating the saints, that they would intercede with God for him; and he that wears a crown, desires the patronage of a tent-maker, and a fisherman who died long since." I cannot approve Chamier's rendering this place, who supposes the emperor is here brought in† not entreating, but only needing the intercession of the saints. His criticism is too subtle, and does not well accord with the place. But be that as it will, I must confess a few intimations of the fact will serve to make me conclude, that very many devout people did, besides their prayers to God, which they made at the memories of the martyrs, entreat also of the martyrs themselves the benefit of their intercessions to God for them; and that because it was generally believed that they were present at their memories.

For if such an opinion should prevail amongst any considerable number of Christians any where, that the souls of martyrs or other saints, were to be conversed with in any certain place, where the people could come within their hearing; it is hardly to be imagined that all, or indeed the most, should restrain themselves from going thither to desire their prayers. And their guides, who themselves believed the presence of the martyrs, would, in all likelihood, be more forward to commend than to reprove them for it, unless they should be well aware of the ill consequences it might produce. And therefore I do not wonder that this new conceit of the presence of the martyrs at their memories, should carry the Christians of those times thither very frequently, and many of them to desire the martyrs to pray for them. This persuasion helped forward the devotion of the age, and was

* Chrys. in 2 Epist. ad Corinth, vers. fin.

† Δεόμενος, δεῖται.

apparently countenanced by some of the Fathers, and it should seem was winked at by all, only St. Austin seemed to doubt of it, as we shall see presently.

But St. Basil made no question of it, and therefore manifestly approved the practice that was grounded upon it. For thus he speaks concerning the memory of the forty martyrs: "Here," says he,* "a religious woman is found praying for her children, and desiring a safe return for her husband that is abroad, and recovery for her sick husband." And then he adds, "Let your prayers be made with the martyrs." I know this passage enforceth no more, than that the prayers made in those places to God, would excite the martyrs to join their intercessions with those of the devout Christian. And, perhaps St. Basil seems to approve this way, more than calling upon the martyrs themselves; because he says, "Let your prayers be made with (not to) the martyrs." But that some Christians did speak to the martyrs too, and were not reproved for it, is, I think, very plain, from what St. Basil says in his oration upon Mamas the martyr: "You remember the martyr," says he, "as many of you as have enjoyed him in dreams; as many of you as coming to this place, have had his help towards your prayers; as many of you as having called to him by name,† have found him present by his works; as many travellers as he hath brought home again," &c. For here I cannot but think that Mamas's being called by name, signifies more than a bare wish, that he would pray for those that are spoken of: especially considering how very natural it was for a belief of the presence of the martyrs in some places, to breed the custom of addressing to them, as a man would do to his friend that is within the compass of hearing: so that I will not go about to put any other construction upon these words, than this plain one, that some of St. Basil's auditors had called to Mamas by name, to pray for them, and to assist them in the procuring of that which they had desired of God, or were about to desire of him.

And here (to use the words of the excellent Bishop Usher)‡ "a man may easily discern the breeding of a disease, and as it were the grudgings of that ague, that brake out afterwards into a pestilential fever."

* Basil. in 40 Martyr. [vol. 2. p. 218. Par. 1839.]

† *Ὁνόματι κληθεῖς*. Basil. Homil. 26 de S. Mam. [ut supra, p. 259.]

‡ Answer to Jesuits' Challenge, p. 444.

I am not insensible what colours this plain and honest dealing may afford to those of the Roman communion, who do not seek for truth, nor are willing that others should find it. What will they now say, but that we begin to confess "the establishment of the invocation of 'saints in the fourth age?" Monsieur de Meaux has said it already upon less occasion given. But we cannot help it, if our concessions be misrepresented by the artifices of some of them, and superficially looked upon by the rest. For my own part, I had rather another man should make a disingenuous advantage of my dealing truly in defence of the truth, than go about to take away from him the occasion of using a pious fraud, by being guilty of a pious fraud myself.

But I will now be bold to say, that there is so vast a difference between the practice of some Christians in the fourth age, who recommended themselves to the prayers of the martyrs; and between the invocation of saints, which is now practised and contended for in the Church of Rome, that the allowance of the former will by no means infer the latter: the fore-mentioned great man has shewn the difference in several particulars, well worth every honest and prudent man's consideration, that desires to inform himself in this matter. And to* him I shall the rather refer the inquisitive reader for them; because I will here add two other differences, which may of themselves be sufficient to shew, that M. de Meaux, who says we begin to acknowledge that the "invocation of saints was established in the fourth age," would be very much beholden to us, if we should make such an acknowledgment: for when the truth comes to be understood, it amounts to this, and no more: that there were but some beginnings and steps made towards this practice, at the latter end of the fourth age; and that these beginnings were not then established neither.

For first, the instances produced to shew, that devout people were wont to recommend themselves to the prayers of the martyrs, do generally shew that they did it at the respective memories of those martyrs, where the martyrs were believed to be within hearing; which, as I shall presently shew, makes a great difference in the case. In the mean time, I do not assert that it was universally believed that the souls of the martyrs were present at their memories; for St. Austin† him-

* Ibid. from p. 445, to p. 457.

† Aug. de Cura pro Mortuis, c. 16. [ut supra, vol. 6. p. 528.]

self durst not affirm it; and though he thought men fared the better for the prayers of the martyrs, yet whether they heard those who called to them at their memories, or wherever else they were thought to have appeared, he professed that it passed the strength of his understanding; and this, although he allowed greater privileges to the martyrs than to other saints. St. Austin could not digest an opinion, that St. Jerome indeed made no difficulty to admit, that a martyr could at the same time be in places very distant from one another. He that will consult St. Jerome* about his reason, may find it in a little compass; and when he has done, he will be satisfied that I do not forbear the mentioning of it for any disadvantage it would bring to our cause. But that which I at present assert, is this: that where we find the faithful desiring any relief by the prayers of the martyrs (whether they prayed to the martyrs themselves or not), we still find them at the proper memories of those martyrs. Thus St. Basil, just now quoted: "You that coming to THIS PLACE have found him an helper to your prayer." Thus St. Jerome also represents Constantia at the tomb of Hilarion, in the relation already mentioned. And thus St. Austin,† in that famous chapter of miracles done by the memories of martyrs, where that relief, which was supposed to be obtained by the twenty martyrs, was asked at their memory, and not at St. Stephen's; as St. Stephen was supposed to help those that prayed at his memory. In like manner St. Chrysostom, who brings in the emperor doing that honour to the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as to stand entreating their prayers: St. Chrysostom, I say, introduces him to their monuments or memories; where it was that this honour was done to them. And so in the oration upon Bernix, Prosdoce, and Domuina, we find this exhortation: "Let us not only upon this (anniversary) festival, but upon other days also stick close to them, and entreat them that we may obtain their patronage."‡ The same observation holds, if you go to the oration upon the Egyptian martyrs,§ and to that upon Ignatius; and indeed it holds so generally, that it should in reason interpret any place that mentions invocation of the martyrs, where it is not evidently expressed that it was done at their memories; I mean, as I said before, their respective

* Hieron. adv. Vigilant. tom. 2. p. 158. [ut supra, p. 387.]

† De Civ. Dei, lib. 22. c. 8. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 668.]

‡ Chrys. tom. 5. Hom. 65. [ut supra, vol. 2. p. 645.]

§ Id. tom. 5.

memories;* unless some other place be distinctly mentioned, as in that place of St. Austin now referred to; where the presence of the martyr, out of his memory, was supposed to be witnessed by his appearing or by his works. But this was very extraordinary. The usual way of soliciting the prayers of a martyr, was to go to his memory.

The hardest passage of all to be accounted for by this rule, is that of St. Ambrose,† where he tells the widows that the angels are to be entreated as well as the martyrs: for though later times have found relics of angels, yet they had none then. The whole place is something obscure, yet I will try to give the best account of it that I can. His business was to persuade widows to continue unmarried; and he tells them that by good works and devotion they would gain the assistance and prayers of the apostles and martyrs, who would now help those who were not akin to them, as effectually as they helped their kindred by their prayers when they were upon earth. And then he has these words, "I would to God that there was somebody who could so readily pray for us! or indeed that very Peter who prayed for his wife's mother, and Andrew his brother; for then they were able to obtain for their kindred, now they can obtain for us and for all." I can make nothing of this, but that St. Ambrose was not sure St. Peter and St. Andrew were near enough to have their prayers desired, or to be spoken to; though the best way to engage their prayers, and to have them near us, was to abound in alms and devotion. But then he adds: "The angels are to be entreated, who are given to us to be our guardians. The martyrs are to be entreated, whose patronage we seem to challenge after a sort, by having the pledge of their bodies. They can pray against our sins, who had washed away their own sins, if they had any, by their own blood." So that the conclusion seems to be this: that although the best way of engaging all the apostles and martyrs, was to abound in alms and prayers; yet it would be very good also for every one to entreat his guardian angel to pray for him, and to desire the same of those martyrs, whose relics were a pledge of their nearness and presence. If this be not the meaning of St. Ambrose (for I do not love to be confident about the meaning of a place that is not very clear), I shall be glad to be better

* Aug. de Cura, ubi supra.

† Ambros. de Viduis, tom. 4. Col. 505, 506. [ut supra, p. 200.]

instructed. If it be, this is a farther confirmation of what I have observed, that the calling upon martyrs in those days went by their relics and memories. And by the way, this single instance of advising to entreat the angels too, seems to proceed upon the common reason, *viz.* a supposition of the presence of those angels, that God had given for our guard. And it was a current opinion amongst some of the Greek Fathers (whom St. Ambrose studied and imitated very industriously), that every good man had his angel; though I am not satisfied that any but St. Ambrose carried the opinion to this conclusion, that men should entreat their angels to pray for them.

So that notwithstanding the singularity of St. Ambrose in advising to call upon angels, I see little reason why he should be thought to speak in this fashion, merely because he was in comparison but a novice in Christianity when he wrote this book. Towards the end of his life he seemed to be as fond as ever he had been of the relics of martyrs, and very desirous to make his prayers over them, if Paulinus* may be believed; who observed, that if the holy priest went to pray in a place at which he had never been seen to pray before, this was a token that he knew by revelation, the body of some martyr to lie hid thereabouts. So that although the bodies he then speaks of were soon translated into the Church of the Apostles; yet St. Ambrose would lose no time, but went forthwith to say his prayers to God at the places where they lay buried, and probably enough to speak to them too; believing that they were there near enough to observe and hear him, and that they would assist him with their prayers.

Thus Sozomen tells us that Theodosius going out of Constantinople, in his expedition against Eugenius, and coming to the seventh mile, there prayed to God,† and likewise called to John the Baptist to help him.‡ I shall not need to insist upon the difference of expression, praying to God, and calling to the saint, though several instances might be produced in favour of such an observation. For here also we find that the place where the Emperor§ prayed to God, and withal called upon the Baptist, was no other than that church which he had built for a memory of St. John Baptist. For it seems, certain

* Paulinus in vita Ambros. Paris. Amb.

† Προσεύξασθαι τῷ θεῷ.

‡ Ἐπικαλέσασθαι. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 24. [ut supra, p. 314.]

§ Ibid. c. 21. [Ibid p. 310.]

monks of the Macedonian heresy were said to have found the head of the Baptist at Jerusalem ; which after several removes, was at last brought by Theodosius to Constantinople, in the suburbs whereof he buried it, and erected a stately church over it : so that here the relics of the martyr were a pledge of his presence and patronage ; and here it was that Theodosius did not only pray to God, but called to the saint for his assistance too. Ruffinus* indeed tells us that he sought help by the intercession of other saints ; but where was it ? Not here at St. John Baptist's memory ; but where the relics of the apostles and martyrs were kept, that is, in other memories. But when the Emperor was come into Italy, and had the enemy before him in the field ; though we find that he prayed, yet there is not the least intimation of calling upon the Baptist, or upon any other saint there. It is only said that prostrating† himself upon the ground he prayed with tears, and God presently heard his prayers. But though the victory was, without all question, to be ascribed to God, yet Sozomen relates a strange story, which he had taken, as it seems, upon common report, how the devil ascribed it to John the Baptist. For the same day that the battle was fought, a man possessed being in the Church of St. John Baptist, was heaved up very high from the ground, and the devil that was in him‡ railed at the Baptist, and reproached him for having lost his head ; but yet could not forbear confessing to him in this manner : "Thou overcomest me, and defeatest my army." I confess I am apt to suspect foul play in this prank of the devil, if it were true ; and do believe that God ought to have had the glory, not a whit the less for the devil's giving it to the saint. But such kind of reports were made use of to confirm people in an opinion of the presence of the martyrs at their memories (for the devil's speaking to John the Baptist here, was his acknowledgment of it), and in the practice of making addresses to them there upon that account.

Nothing yet appears to the contrary, but that they who thought the martyrs heard when they were spoken to, believed their presence to be limited to some certain places, in the compass of which they were within hearing. But I am not so vain as to undertake that there were none in those days who

* Ruffin. Hist. lib. 2. c. 33. [p. 260. Basil. 1535.]

† Sozom. lib. 7. c. 24. [Ibid. p. 314.]

‡ Sozom. lib. 7. c. 24. [Ibid. p. 315.]

called upon the martyrs in all places indifferently. For while the great men of that age seemed to give a full scope to that strain of zeal towards the martyrs, which was now going forward ; it is to be feared rather (though no such thing appears), that some of the people made no difference between calling upon their martyrs at their memories, or anywhere else. And so it certainly was, when one of those sermons* was written that are falsely attributed to St. Ambrose.

But it is enough for my present purpose that the custom of calling upon the martyrs at their respective memories was as yet very notorious. And this indeed was the ground of that scoff of Vigilantius, for which St. Jerome chastises him so severely.† “What,” says he, “are the souls of the martyrs therefore so fond of their own ashes? Do they hover about them, and are always present with them, lest perhaps if any one comes to pray they should be absent, and incapable of hearing him?” To the matter of which question St. Jerome was almost silent : but he lashes him for abusing and laughing at the relics of the martyrs. The truth is, Vigilantius had hit that popular opinion that the martyrs were very much present with their relics, and consequently, that the best way to be sure of them, was to go to the churches where their relics were, unless (which happened very seldom) they should discover a particular affection to some other place, as St. Hilarion did to the garden of Cyprus, after his relics were stolen out of it. .

Now therefore, as the first addresses that were made to the martyrs, had not the nature of prayer or religious invocation in any other respect ; so neither in this, that they ascribed omnipresence to the saints or martyrs. For not only the belief of that age but the practice of it too, in seeking the intercession of the saints, limited their presence to some determinate places, and generally to their respective memories. They that called upon the saints at all, did not indifferently call upon them in any place, but (if we may gather the general practice from such particular instances as we have) they invoked them in some certain place only where they were thought to be within hearing. Nor can I find that they thought it reasonable to speak so much as to one saint at the memory of another ; but rather to every saint at his own.

Which makes the addresses of those times to the martyrs

* Serm. de Fest. Nazarii et Celsi. tom. 4.

† Hieron. adv. Vigil. ubi supra. [p. 395.]

very different from the invocation of saints in the Church of Rome, which hath let her children loose to call upon every saint in every place, as occasion requires; and has furnished them with litanies of supplication to all the saints, to be used in all places of the world.

He that cannot see a wide difference between these two things, can see nothing. The first practice of all, setting aside the ill consequences of it, was (to say the worst of it) but a harmless superstition; that is, when as yet the relics of the martyrs were entire, and there was but one memory to one. The next step indeed was something dangerous, which began also in this age, and that was, allowing some of them several memories in distant places; at every one of which I believe they were spoken to by some or other; though it was yet pretty well that they confined them all within some bounds. But the last practice is an intolerable affront to the Divine Majesty, because it does in effect ascribe omnipresence to a creature. The progress of the mischief from so small a beginning to so strange a conclusion, was plainly this. By dispersing the relics of the same martyrs into two or more, and at length into many places, their memories were by degrees strangely multiplied; and that, to speak the truth, not inconsiderably in the next age, as appears by Theodoret;* and so by degrees they were allowed a greater, and by the help of new relics (when the old ones would bear dividing no longer), still a greater compass of presence; till at last superstition and worldly policy together would not allow any bounds at all to be set to their presence, but would have them called upon no less than God in all places whatsoever.

This account of the latter practices of the fourth age in this matter, and of the grounds of their practice, may perhaps deserve to be added to a great many others; whereby the difference of the addresses to the martyrs in that age, from the Roman invocation of saints, has been shewn. I shall say no more of it than that it may appear fair and reasonable to any man that shall take the pains to compare one thing with another. At least it deserves some consideration; because, if the addresses that were made in that age to the martyrs were limited to some certain places, it will destroy an appeal to that age for an invocation which is unlimited, and ascribes omnipresence to the saints. And therefore if in assigning this

* Theod. de Cur. Græc. Aff. l. 8. de Mart. [vol. 4. p. 908. Hal. 1769.]

difference, I have proceeded upon a mistake of the practice of that age, the gentlemen of the Church of Rome are concerned to shew it. And when they do, it will be my part to shew that I am not fond of a notion; but can with more ease reject it, when it appears to be false, than I entertained it while it seemed to be true.

But then, 2. As the addresses of the fourth age to the saints were not properly religious invocations, so neither were they established in the Church. There was no public rule or order for them, but they were wholly the effects of a private and voluntary zeal, encouraged by some of the guides of the Church, and perhaps connived at by all. They were, I say, the actions of so many single Christians, in behalf of themselves or their near relations, but no part of the established service of the Church. The Liturgies were everywhere still the same, and none but God was called upon in the service performed at the religious assemblies of the Church. If the pretended Catholics could shew a change in the service of the Church about this time, favouring the invocation of saints, that indeed were something. But then they must not refer us to the shameful interpolations of St. Chrysostom's, and other ancient liturgies. It were an easy matter to be very large upon this head; but for a reason I shall mention presently, we will for the present go no further than to St. Austin. For if his authority be of any weight with them, they will see, that whatever was done in the way of private worship by single persons, there was no change of the service of the Church in this respect, but that God only was invoked in the stated assemblies of the faithful. Let us therefore hear what St. Austin says.* "The Gentiles," saith he, "have built temples, raised altars, and ordained priests, and offered sacrifices to their gods. But we do not erect temples to our martyrs, as if they were gods, but memories as to dead men, whose spirits live with God. Nor do we erect altars, upon which to sacrifice to martyrs, but to one God only do we offer, the God of martyrs, and our God; at which sacrifice, as men of God, who in confessing him have overcome the world, they are named in their place and order; but they are not invoked by the priest who sacrifices."

St. Austin plainly speaks of the public service of the Church, at the assemblies of the faithful; in which, if we will

* De Civit. Dei, lib. 22. c. 10. [ut supra, vol. 7. p. 673.]

take his word, no addresses were made but to God only. And he expressly says, "that the priest who administered the service, did not invoke the martyrs, but named them in order, as men that had overcome the world;" that is, gave thanks and praises to God for them. And here I am much mistaken, or else there is an observable difference intimated between the voluntary addresses of single persons to the martyrs at their memories, and between the mention that was made of the martyrs, when the faithful assembled for the ordinary service of God at the same memories: for when, in voluntary and private devotion, the saints were spoken to, it was still at their respective memories; but in the assemblies of the Church for divine service, they were indifferently mentioned in their place and order, at all the memories of the martyrs, but not invocated. But that which I chiefly observe is this: that neither was the martyr, whose memory was the place of God's public service, invocated in the prayers of the Church; so that even the addresses of that age to a martyr, at his own memory, were not established by the order and service of the Church; but left to the voluntary zeal of single persons.

And therefore those passages of this Father, referred to by M. de Meaux, make nothing for invocation of saints. St. Austin, it seems (though it was a singular opinion of his), thought "it an injury to a martyr* to pray for him, by whose prayers we ourselves are to be commended;" and therefore the martyrs were not mentioned in that place of the service, where "other dead persons were commemorated," viz. those for whom prayer was made. And says he,† "at the holy table we do not so commemorate them, as we do others that rest in peace," viz. as those "for whom we pray; but rather as those that pray for us, that we may tread in their steps." Now though St. Austin was one of those that doubted whether the petition of the faithful arrived to the knowledge of the martyrs; yet he doubted not that the martyrs prayed for the faithful, which is all that can be proved from these places. But what is this to the invocation of them? which St. Austin also expressly denies, in saying "that they are not invocated by the priest who sacrifices."

And here we must remember what the ancient Fathers meant by the "Christian sacrifice." Not only the oblation of bread and wine brought by all the people, and presented at

* De verb. Apost. Serm. 17. [Ibid. vol. 5. p. 765.]

† Tractat. in Joh. 84. [Ibid. vol. 3. par. 2. p. 709.]

the holy table, with the prayers of the priest, nor only the consecration of those elements afterwards, to be the memorials of Christ's body and blood, which they first laid before God, and then distributed to the faithful: I say, we must remember that they did not only mean these visible sacrifices, but likewise all the prayers, praises, and thanksgivings of the Church, which were vocal sacrifices, together with "contrition of heart," and all "pious affections" answerable to the outward sacrifices; by which the faithful offered up* themselves a sacrifice to God. This was "that reasonable service," and "unbloody sacrifice," which the priest, in behalf of all the people, solemnly offered up to God. So that St. Austin's meaning is this: that the faithful being assembled at the memories of the martyrs for divine service, the martyrs are not invoked by the priest in any part of the administration. And therefore the distinction of sacrificial and extra-sacrificial prayers will not avoid this testimony, since the prayers of the faithful, at their religious assemblies, were all sacrificial prayers, as being part of the Christian sacrifice.

And St. Austin, whose testimony this is, did, in this notion of sacrifice, clearly follow the doctrine of the more ancient Fathers:† "Let us observe," saith he, "that where God said, he would not have sacrifice; there it is shewn, that he will have sacrifice. He willeth not the sacrifice of a slain beast, but he will have the sacrifice of a contrite heart." And afterwards he addeth these instances, as the ancients had done before him. The Psalmist saith, "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the Most High, and call upon me in the day of tribulation, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me."

It is true, that he sometimes distinguisheth the "visible oblations" of the Church, from prayers and praises; as where he argues, that the "visible sacrifices"‡ are to be offered up to God only, whose "visible sacrifice" we ourselves are in our hearts; as in vocal prayer and praise we pray to God, and praise him only, to whom we offer the devotion of the heart. But though in that place he doth not call prayers and praises "sacrifices," as he doth elsewhere very frequently; yet even there he taketh it for granted, that when the faithful were assembled for praying to God, and praising him, they addressed themselves to none but to him.

* Aug. de Civ. lib. 10. c. 6. [Ibid. vol. 7. p. 242.]

† Ibid. lib. 10. c. 5. [Ibid. vol. 7. p. 241.]

‡ Ibid. c. 19. [p. 255.]

It is so plain, even from this Father, that the invocation of martyrs and saints, was no part of the service of the Church, that I have thought fit to insist only upon his testimony; especially since M. de Meaux has been pleased to bring in the words of the Council of Trent, explaining their practice in invoking the saints: "Because," saith he, "the Council doth almost make use of the words of this holy bishop." Let us first hear the words of the Council: "The Church does not offer sacrifices to the saints, but to God alone, who has crowned them: the priest also does not address himself to St. Peter and St. Paul, saying, I offer up to you this sacrifice; but rendering thanks to God for their victories, he demands THEIR ASSISTANCE, to the end that those, whose memory we celebrate upon earth, would vouchsafe to pray for us in heaven." Now let us hear the words of St. Austin, in that place to which M. de Meaux refers. "But we do not appoint temples, priesthoods, holy rites, and sacrifices, to the martyrs, because not they, but their God is our God. Indeed, we honour the memories of martyrs, as of holy men, &c. But who of the faithful ever heard the priest, standing at the altar, though erected for the honour and worship of God, over the holy body of a martyr,* to say in the prayers, I offer sacrifice to thee, O Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian; when at their memories it is offered to God, who made them both men and martyrs, and associated them to the angels in heavenly glory: that by this solemnity we may give thanks to the true God for their victories, and that we, by renewing in ourselves the remembrance of them, may be excited, by imitating them, to strive for such crowns and palms as they have obtained,† THE SAME true God BEING INVOCATED FOR OUR ASSISTANCE." It seems there is almost no difference made by putting the saints instead of God. Let M. de Meaux lay his hand upon his heart, and tell us honestly for once, whether "*eodem invocata in auxilium*," do not refer to the true God spoken of before, and not to the saints? And if so, what is there in this passage of the "holy bishop," that makes for the invocation of saints?

And now M. de Meaux may go on as long as he thinks fit to make triumphs, upon our "acknowledgment,‡ that during the fourth century, the Church desired the prayers of martyrs, and honoured relics." For he goes on in this strain, in his

* Aug. de Civitat. lib. 8. c. 27. [p. 217.]

† Eodem invocato in Auxilium. [Ibid.]

‡ Pastoral Letter, [ut supra,] p. 29.

late Pastoral Letter; where he declaims so tragically against those that (if you will believe him) charge idolatry upon the “ illustrious fourth age ; yea, that very age whercin the prophecies of the kingdom of Jesus Christ were accomplished more manifestly than ever ; when the kings of the earth, till then persecutors of the name of Jesus, became, according to ancient oracles, his adorers.” My Lord the Bishop of Meaux knew when it was convenient to use the style of a perfect gentleman. But since he wrote his Exposition,* the *case* of some of his countrymen is something altered, though the *cause* be the same. Now the blasphemies of the Protestants put him into fits of amazement, and he cannot tell† “ what horror they are worthy of.” But to do him right, he keeps true to one old principle, that will, I believe, be dear to him as long as he lives :‡ “ Once more, my brethren, let us not dispute, let us not run into controversy.” No, by no means ; for it is much easier to declaim than to dispute ; to take things for granted, than to prove them ; and to make general flourishes, than to enter into examination of particulars. What can be more easy than to exclaim in this manner?§ “ The Ambroses, the Augustines, the Jeromes, the Gregories of Nazianzen, the Basiluses, and the Chrysostoms, whom all Christians have respected, even till now, as the doctors of truth !” But hold a little ; if great names will do the business, let us see what we can do in this kind : “ Can you endure, my brethren, those who have forsaken the Irenæuses, the Justin Martyrs, the Clemenses of Alexandria, the Tertullians, the Origens, the Cyprians, the Athanasiuses, whom all Christians do pretend even now to respect as doctors of truth ? Those, my brethren, that were more ancient than the Ambroses, &c. and most of whom laid down their lives in a glorious martyrdom, which none of the others did. It is true, brethren,|| that some part of ‘ the prophecies ’ was fulfilled when the Empire took the Church into its protection ; but we do not find it was foretold also, that the Christians of that age would be wiser or better than their forefathers. Does not M. de Meaux tell us,¶ ‘ that Antichrist must come according to the predictions of the Apostles.’ But when that happens, the times are not to be much the better for it. It was the admirable goodness of God to crown the Church at last with peace

* [Ibid.] p. 30.

§ [Ibid.] p. 30.

† [Ibid.] p. 29.

|| [Ibid.] p. 29.

‡ [Ibid.] p. 16.

¶ [Ibid.] p. 2.

and glory. But do not think the authority of that age is to be regarded the more, because it was illustrious for the wealth and splendour of this world, lest, by the same reason, you should undervalue the authority of the more ancient ages, which were illustrious for nothing but truth, and godliness, and martyrdom; which if you will do, my brethren, might we not well cry out, ‘O prodigy, unheard of amongst Christians!’ That we should begin to think it a better mark of a *pure* Church, to have it in her power to persecute others, than to endure persecution herself after the example of Christ and his Apostles.”

It is an easy matter to requite a declamation. But would not the Bishop of Meaux say to this, that the Irenæuses, &c. do not condemn what is now practised in the Church of Rome? So do we say, that we are far from charging the Ambroses, &c. with idolatry; and that the doctrines and practices of that age, with respect to the points that we are upon, are so vastly different from what we now see in the Church of Rome, that if the Church of Rome be idolatrous, it does by no means follow, that the fourth age was so. So that we must come to disputing at last, whether we will or no, if we talk of these questions to any purpose.

I have shewn the first steps that were made towards the invocation of saints, which I confess is an innovation maintained by the Church of Rome, that of all the rest bids the fairest for antiquity: because there was a certain address to martyrs used by many Christians, and commended by some of the Fathers towards the latter end of the fourth age, which looks something like it, till you come near to examine the matter thoroughly. But then you may discern so considerable a difference, that it is a vain thing to pretend, that the invocation of saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, was as ancient as the conclusion of the fourth age. And what we need to grant, is this: that those beginnings are so ancient, which first did give occasion to it, and which, with the help of ignorance and superstition, did at length bring it into the Church.

§. 11. Hitherto the honour done to the martyrs, was that of founding churches upon their relics, and frequenting them both for the public service of God, and for private devotions; in which the martyrs themselves were sometimes called upon, as if they were present at their memories. But this was done before their images came to be set up in the Church so much

as for ornament, and long before they were thought of for worship. We have already noted the act of Epiphanius, in tearing down the picture of Christ, or some saint (for he knew not well what it was), which he found upon a veil: an act of indignation so much the more remarkable, because the church where it was done was in the diocese of John bishop of Jerusalem; to whom therefore* Epiphanius thought fit to give an account of it in that epistle which is to be seen in St. Jerome's works: and the reason he gives for what he did is as remarkable as the action was. "When I saw this in a church of Christ, that the picture of a man should be hanged up there, against the authority of Scriptures, I tare it," &c. And again, "I entreat thee to command the presbyters of that place to provide for the future, that such veils, being contrary to what our religion allows, may not be hanged up in the Church of Christ."

But as for the images of martyrs and saints, why should I go about to prove, that they were not yet brought into churches, when the pretended Catholics are fain to give reasons why they were hardly to be met with amongst Christians, even out of churches. Petavius excuseth the matter thus: "The images of Christ and the saints were not used, lest they should be taken by the rude and unskilful people for idols, to which they had been accustomed." And afterward: "Images are not evil of themselves, nor forbidden by any law of God; nevertheless, that no shadow of superstition and idolatry might give offence to the tender, and, as I may say, the unsettled minds of Christians, and that the Gentiles might not object to those of our religion, who abhorred idols, and dissuaded men from them, that themselves also had certain images of their own; it is likely they were but sparingly used for about the first four ages; all which time, the abominable worship of devils in idols, together with a most cruel vexation of the Christian name, went on. At length the fifth age being come, after that the Church had gained her freedom, and began boldly to stretch forth her arms, images began to appear in most places, and were shewn in temples and oratories; whereas hitherto, though they had been in some use, yet they were not to be seen so promiscuously and frequently." In good time! But if such a man as Petavius could have shewn any

* Hieron. tom. 2. Ep. 60. v. fin. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 251.]

† Petav. Dogm. Theol. tom. 4. part. 2. c. 13. p. 582, 583. [Par. 1644.]

use of images all this while, that any art could draw to his purpose, he had not served the cause with this miserable account of the late setting up of images. With the like to which Salmeron satisfied himself, as to the silence of the Scriptures about the worship of saints, as we have already seen. Now to make this appear likely, he insists upon it, that the ancients disputed against the temples and altars of the heathens; though when peace and liberty was given to the Church, the Christians had magnificent churches and altars of their own. But nothing can be more vain; for from the first the Church had its altars or holy tables, and its holy places too, such as the times would permit. And therefore this instance doth not reach to the case of images, which they had not. But where the state of the controversy lay between the Christians and the heathens about temples and altars, and what was the difference between the one and the other, is too long to insert here; and therefore I refer the reader to Mr. Mede's Discourse concerning Churches, Par. 1. Book 2, where it is handled with exquisite diligence.

But if Petavius's reason hath any probability, why were not images brought in presently upon Constantine's coming to the empire, at least after the death of Julian? For then the Church enjoyed peace and power; unless it were to be said, that by stepping boldly into that practice (as soon as they had gained power), which they had utterly condemned in their distress, they knew that they should bring the reproach of insincerity upon their profession, and that therefore it was more advisable to step into it by degrees. But he that can believe this of the ancient Church, must not pretend any great reverence for it.

But whereas Petavius thought this to be the likely reason, why we hear not of images so long together, *viz.* that it would furnish the heathens with objections: I shall not fear to oppose this conjecture with another, and to say, that it is more likely and credible, that if the ancient Fathers had thought it lawful to bow down to images, and to worship them, they would have brought this practice in with one consent; and that because the Gentiles had been accustomed to the worshipping of images: for it is incomparably more easy to bring men from worshipping some images to worship others (as the Jesuits know by experience), than from worshipping images, to worship none at all. Nay, it is yet more likely that images were brought into several churches in the fifth age, in compliance

with the inclinations of many of the Gentiles ; who, now the Church shined with the glory of the world, thronged into it, before they had worn off their superstition and fondness of images ; and that the reason why it was done no sooner, was this : that the zeal of the ancient Church against images being yet fresh in the minds of men, must needs hinder their coming into any use immediately, and leave it to be a work of some time. And it is not unlikely that Petavius himself was well aware of these things, for otherwise he was not likely to confess, that in “ this controversy about images, we are not to have regard to the examples and orders of the more ancient Church, but rather of later times ; ” which is in more civil terms, to confess it was an innovation ; for surely this learned Jesuit knew better than to say, that in a controversy about the antiquity of worshipping images, we ought rather to regard later times than the ancient Church.

But they that will find Church-authority for image-worship, must go down yet lower, even beyond the fifth, sixth, and seventh ages of the Church. Pictures were in the fifth age brought into divers churches, for ornament and instruction. The histories of the Old and New Testament, and at length the passions of martyrs, and the stories of saints were to be seen upon the walls of churches. Indeed when the seventh age was now coming in, we find the people of Marseilles began to worship images ; which Serenus* their bishop discerning, broke them down. Which breaking of them, Gregory the Great disallowed, because he thought images were instead of books to them that could not read ; but the worshipping of them he disallowed as much as Serenus. It is likely enough, that some unwarrantable regard to images began about the same time to obtain in other places : for in the seventh age there were warm controversies about it, which grew to such a heat in the reign of Leo Isaurus, that he commanded the images to be broken down. But superstition had gotten such a head, that this would not do ; for his son Constantine was forced to call together a Council (which consisted of 338 bishops), to put an end to those troubles, if it might be done. And they did their parts effectually ; for they did not only decree against the worshipping of images, but the retaining of them. Now thirty years after this, towards the end of the

* Greg. lib. 9. Ep. 9. ad Serenum. [lib. 11. Ind. 4. Ep. 13. p. 1100. Par. 1705.]

eighth age, another Council was assembled at Nice, by the promotion of the Empress Irene; in which image-worship was stoutly maintained, but with such kind of arguments, that if I were for the worship of images, I should be very well content to lose the advantage of the Council's authority, provided I might never be reproached with their reasoning. The cause was upheld by Adrian I. then Bishop of Rome, who sent the acts of this second Nicene Council to Charles the Great. Charles calls a Council of Italian, German, and French bishops at Frankfort, in which it was determined against the Constantinopolitan Council, that images might be retained; and smartly concluded against these Nicene Fathers, that without impiety they could not be worshipped. It was unlucky, that the late beginning of antiquity for the worship of images, should be discredited by such an authority, and robbed of all pretence to universality. And therefore Petavius, as others had done, comforts himself with that vain pretence, that the Council of Frankfort* understood not the sense of the Nicene bishops. It is a vain pretence, because the acts of the Nicene Council lay before the Fathers of Frankfort. But the Nicene doctrine was condemned about thirty-two years after this at Paris, and was indeed generally opposed in the Western Churches. So that it seems there is some reason why image-worshippers should not regard the examples and constitutions of the ancient, but rather of the latter times of the Church.

But when began the worship of the blessed Virgin? And why have we forgotten her all this while? Even because the Fathers forgot her first. It is true, we find in Gregory Nazianzen's† Oration upon St. Cyprian, the story of Justina the virgin, calling upon the Virgin Mary to defend her against the unchaste designs of Cyprian; who, if we may believe the tale, was once a conjuror at Antioch, &c. But by St. Cyprian's life, written by Pontius his deacon, it is evident that this story is void of all circumstance of truth.‡ Baronius himself confesses as much: and by the endeavours that have been used to mend the tale for the credit of Gregory Nazianzen, it is plain, that there is no remedy, but it must go for an inexcusable business: and therefore, if ever there was cause from the matter of a writing imputed to a man of great name and

* Petav. Dog. Th. tom. 5. Par. 2. lib. 15.

† Greg. Naz. Orat. 18. tom. 1. [vol. 1. p. 279. Par. 1630.]

‡ Bar. A.D. 250. N. 5. [ut supra, p. 564.] See Daille de Object. Cultus, p. 51, &c. [Genev. 1664.]

authority, to conclude it is none of his, this equity is to be shewn to Gregory Nazianzen ; it being incredible that a man of his worth and abilities should either invent such a lie, or be made to believe it. I confess it is hard on the one hand, to believe that this story should be so dexterously shuffled into Nazianzen's Oration, that the impostor was never discovered ; yet, on the other hand, it is hard to believe that such a man as he should lend his belief and his breath to so absurd a fable.

Epiphanius* also tells us of some Arabian women that worshipped the Virgin Mary, by laying a cake before her for some days, and offering it up to her, and then eating it amongst themselves. But that which he says upon this occasion is by no means for the comfort of her worshippers. "Let us," saith he, "put on the spirits of men, and beat down the madness of these women." I know it will be said, that this reproof of those that sacrificed to the blessed Virgin reaches not those that do not sacrifice to her, but worship her without sacrifice. But I am sure Epiphanius makes no such distinction ; "for," says he, "who of the prophets ever allowed that a man should be worshipped, much less a woman ?" If it was the doctrine of those times, that the blessed Virgin was more glorious than the cherubim and seraphim, Epiphanius did strangely forget himself and the person he was speaking of, when he supposed a man might rather be made an object of religious worship than a woman, though the blessed Virgin.

For thus he goes on : "Though the Virgin be a chosen vessel, she is yet but a woman.—The old error shall not reign amongst us, to leave the living God, and to worship things that he has made ; for if he will not suffer the angels to be adored, how much less the daughter of Joachim and Anne, who was born to them as other mortals are born, &c. of a father and mother." If the Virgin had then been invoked with prayers and hymns, is it to be thought that Epiphanius,† who in the foregoing discourse raised the honour of the Virgin as high as truth would suffer him, would not have said it there, or distinguished it from sacrifice here ? He says, indeed, "Let Mary be honoured ; but let the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be adored." But if it had been

* Epiph. Hæres. 79. lib. 3. tom. 2. adv. Collyrid. [vol. 1. p. 1058. Colon. 1682.]

† Hær. 78. adv. Antidicom.

then as it is now, Epiphanius could not have avoided saying, "Let Mary be worshipped with religious invocation indeed, but let God only be worshipped with sacrifice." But does he intimate any thing of this nature? Nay, he does as plainly exclude all religious worship of her, as it was possible to exclude a thing which had not then obtained in the Church. "For," says he, "God did not commit the power of baptizing to Mary, or of blessing his disciples, or any authority upon earth. This only he vouchsafed to her, to be a sanctified creature, and worthy to enter into his kingdom." But if she had been then adored in any sort, and Epiphanius had approved it, he was strangely forgetful of the duty of a good writer, not to mention it in this place at least, where the plain rules of discourse obliged him, and would have led him to it. All which makes it evident that we are to take worship or adoration here in the proper sense of the word, and not for visible sacrifices only. And the whole place is the more unlucky to the worshippers of the blessed Virgin, because no comfort is to be had from that expression of honouring* her, which Epiphanius requires we should do. For that by this he did not mean any religious worship is, I think, reasonably plain, from what he says concerning Eve in this very discourse: "Let our mother Eve† be honoured, as being formed by God." I do not know that prayers are said to Eve in the Roman Church; but I am confident Epiphanius was a stranger to any such thing in his time. So that if we examine these words of worshipping and honouring, as they stand in Epiphanius, never so long, they will confess this, and no more, that we must think and speak very honourably of Mary, as being a most holy woman, and the virgin mother of Jesus; but that we must at no hand adore her with any sort of invocation or religious rites whatsoever. And so I shall conclude this plain business with the words of Epiphanius: "Although Mary be excellently good and holy, and to be honoured, she is not yet to be honoured so as to be worshipped." By which we may judge of the modesty or understanding of him, whoever he was, that clapped the name of St. Epiphanius to that fulsome oration‡ concerning the blessed Virgin, where the angels, cherubim and seraphim, are brought in adoring her, &c.

As for what we have concerning the blessed Virgin in the

* ἐν τιμῇ ἔσω Μαρία. [Ibid. p. 1064.] ● † τιμάσθω.

‡ De Laudib. Virg. Mar. tom. 2. Epiph. [ut supra, vol. 2. p. 293.]

Liturgy, said to be St. Chrysostom's, and pretended to be translated by Erasmus, it is all manifest interpolation, being directly contrary to St. Chrysostom's doctrine in his undoubted writings. Could he that affirms, that if Christ were not by nature the Son of God,* he had been inferior to the angels, affirm also that the blessed Virgin (who is naturally no goddess) is "incomparably more glorious than the cherubim and seraphim?" Or that she was unspotted, whom he plainly notes for ambition and desire for worldly glory,† and supposes to be checked by Jesus for it? Concerning the blessed Virgin, and the privilege she had by being the mother of Jesus, they spake in those days as we of the Reformation now do. St. Chrysostom be witness for this, in the place last cited. "When thou hearest that woman saying, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps* that gave thee suck;' and then himself answering, 'Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it:' do not think that these words argued contempt of his mother, but that he would shew how little it would profit her that she was his mother, if she were not exceedingly good and faithful. But if it profited Mary nothing at all, that Christ was born of her, unless she had the virtue of the soul, much less good will it do us, to have an excellent father, brother, or child, whilst we have none of their virtue.—For we are to place our hope of salvation in nothing next to the grace of God, but only in our proper good actions and qualities. For if that relation which Mary had to Christ, were a thing of itself profitable, the Jews had found it so in some degree; for Christ was akin to them after the flesh; and so had the city in which he was born, and so had his brethren. But whilst his brethren did just what they pleased themselves, the honour they had to be of akin to him profited them not at all; but they were condemned with the rest of the world." A great deal more to this purpose you may find in this excellent Father, and that in the place by me cited; by which you may see what the strain of that age was, as to the blessed Virgin, and how very unlike to that which was taken up in following times; some instances of which we have in Homilies falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom.‡

* εἰ δὲ χάριτί ἐστιν υἱός, οὐ μόνον οὐ διαφωρότερος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλάττω ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων. Chrys. in Hebr. c. 1. Hom. 2. [vol. 12. p. 20. Par. 1735.]

† Id. in Joan. c. 2. Hom. 20. [Ibid. vol. 8. p. 122.]

‡ De uno Legislatore. In Samaritanam, &c. tom. 6.

In short, if we set aside spurious works, such as the sermon concerning the Assumption of the blessed Virgin, published in St. Jerome's works, and attributed by some to Sophronius, but was most certainly written long after they were both dead; and the two prayers (attributed to St. Ambrose*) Preparatory to Mass; in the second of which, God is desired (according to the genius of after-times) to "inspire the blessed Virgin first," and then the "Apostles," and then the "martyrs and confessors," with the thought of "praying to God for the priest:" but the best learned amongst the Papists have been ashamed to produce these prayers as St. Ambrose's, they are so evidently supposititious. If we set aside also the book of Meditations, which the Latin rhymes that are in it convince of novelty; the treatise of the Assumption, attributed to St. Austin, and the sermons under his name, upon the feast of the Annunciation, which could be none of his, because that feast was not then in being; and, in one word, all those writings which learned men of the Roman communion have confessed to be at least doubtful, though they had for some time gone under names of Fathers of the fourth age. Setting these aside, I say, we find but moderate things spoken of the blessed Virgin.

After all the pains that have been taken to make some of her Festivals ancient, it is more than probable, that as yet she had none; and that the Fathers of the fourth age, who are cited for one or two of them, have been, without their consent, made to speak the sense of after-ages, that were loath to be destitute of all pretence from antiquity, for making the honour of the blessed Virgin outshine all that was done to other martyrs and saints. For the Constitutions† do not so much as mention one of her festivals, where one would think they should have omitted none.

The Salutation of Ave Maria has now, for some time, run through the religion of the Church of Rome, in public and private devotions; but in this age no example or recommendation of any such thing is to be met withal.

No, nor one prayer to her do we yet hear of; which plainly shews, that (whatever the superstition of some one private person or other might be, of which we cannot affirm or deny

* Tom. 4. [vol. 2. Append. p. 497, 498. Par. 1690.]

† Constat. Apost. l. 8. c. 33. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. .497. Lut. Par. 1671.]

any thing) her worship was no part of the religion of the age. If you would know the first bold man, after the Collyridians, that brought her into the Church to be invoked, Nicephorus will tell you it was one Peter Fullo,* a bishop indeed, but an Eutychian, who found out four very profitable things, if you will believe Nicephorus; one whereof was, "that the holy name of the Virgin should be called upon in every prayer." How the invention of this man was entertained, I cannot say: he lived near the sixth age. But neither is thus much antiquity to be boasted of, nor was it for the credit of the innovation, to have an heretic for its author.

The Church was full of the memories of the martyrs; but as yet the blessed Virgin had none. What a strange thing was it, that Theodoret, who ran the honour of the martyrs to that height, that it requires some candour to bring him down with safety and honour: that he, I say, should make no mention at all of the blessed Virgin, and the solemnities that were due to her; and that in a discourse where he professedly brings in the martyrs, supplanting those demons which had been so long served by the Pagan world, he could name† Peter, Paul, Thomas, Sergius, Marcellus, Leontius, Antoninus, and Mauritius. Do we think the blessed Virgin had been left to be understood amongst "the other saints" that had their solemnities also, if she had had, even in Theodoret's time, any at all? But why should we talk of her memories, when as yet her relics were not found, nor in all likelihood sought for? Since if they had, it is not to be doubted, but those monks, or others like them, that went up and down with "the bones of martyrs, if indeed they were martyrs' bones," would have gratified the curiosity of devout people with some of those relics that posterity a long time after was blessed with, *viz.* some of the blessed Virgin's hair, her combs, her hood, her slipper, her espousal ring, nay, and some of her milk too, with such other things, which came not to light till some ages after the zeal of relics began in the Church.

But when once devotion began to turn towards her, no time was lost; and though it was late first, yet her service presently overtook, and at last went beyond the honour that was done to other saints and martyrs. The thirteenth age produced a

* Niceph. Hist. l. 15. c. 28. [vol. 2. p. 634. Lut. Par. 1630.]

† Theod. de curandis Græc. affect. De Martyr. ad fin. [vol. 4. p. 923. Hal. 1769.]

relic of the blessed Virgin, so famous for the miracle that brought it into Europe, and for the miracles that have been done by it ever since, that the relics of the other saints are nothing to it : and that is her house, once at Nazareth, where she was born, and visited by the angel ; which house was carried by angels out of Palestine into Dalmatia, and from thence into Italy, where it now stands, and is our Lady of Loretto's Chapel. By the fourteenth century she had gained no less than seven festivals in the year ; which I mention, to shew the growing devotion of the Roman Church towards the blessed Virgin ; not that we make this any great matter of complaint ; no, though they were twice seven, if the facts upon which they were grounded were true, and the ground reasonable, and God only were worshipped in the celebration of such festivals.

The later doctors have made too much amends for the modesty of the ancient Fathers, who spake indeed of her very honourably, but within bounds. The world was something altered in the middle of the seventh age, if Pope Martin said what we find in Anastasius :* "Whoever does not honour and adore the blessed Virgin, the mother of God, let him be accursed." Of which curse, Germanus,† the Patriarch of Constantinople, was in no danger, if he addressed himself in this manner to the blessed Virgin : "Nobody is replenished with the knowledge of God but by thee, O most holy. Nobody is saved but by thee, O mother of God. Nobody is delivered from danger but by thee, O thou beloved of God." Again : "Thou having the power of a mother with God, dost beyond measure gain pardon for them, who sin beyond measure. For it cannot be that thou shouldest not be heard, because to all purposes and in all things, and through all things God obeys thee as his true and immaculate mother." This was pretty well for the eighth age ; as likewise was that of Damascene, who calls the blessed Virgin, ‡ "The lady and governess of all creatures." No wonder therefore that Cardinal Peter Damian coming long after these, telleth her, that she "comes before the altar of reconciliation, not asking, but commanding ; as a lady, not as a servant." I know not whether he was the author of those glorious titles, which have since furnished some of the hymns that we meet with in the offices of the

* Collectan. Anast. p. 73.

† German. in Biblioth. P. tom. 12. p. 704.

‡ Joh. Damasc. lib. 4. c. 15. [p. 146. Basil. 1539.]

blessed Virgin :* “The Queen of the World,” “The Window of Heaven,” “The Gate of Paradise,” “The Tabernacle of God,” “The Star of the Sea,” “The Heavenly Ladder, by which the Heavenly King came down to us below, and by which man, who grovelled upon the ground, ascends in exaltation to heaven.” But Anselm, that lived in the same age with him, speaks more fully:† “As God is the Father, and God of all things, by his power creating all things; so blessed Mary, the mother of God, restoring all things by her merits, is the mother and lady of the universe.” Which agrees very well with that reason he had given before, why her Son went to heaven before her:‡ “Perhaps, O Lord, lest thy court in Heaven should stand in doubt, whom it should rather go out to meet, thee their Lord coming to take possession of thy kingdom, or her their Lady ascending to that kingdom also, which belonged to her by a mother’s right.”§ To this nothing could be added in so little a time beyond Bonaventure’s Psalter; who, taking the Psalms of David, put in *Lady* instead of *Lord*, in this manner: “O come, let us sing unto our Lady,” &c. “Let every thing that hath breath praise our Lady.” But not content with this, he framed the Athanasian Creed to her service too, beginning thus:|| “Whosoever will be saved,

* Hom. 46. de Nativ. B. Mar. 1. tom. 2. p. 106.

† Anselm. Cant. de Excell. Virgin. c. 11.

‡ Ibid. c. 7.

§ See Answer to Jesuits’ Chall. from p. 478 to p. 495.

|| Psalt. Bonav. p. 111, 112. Paris. [vol. 6. p. 515, 516. Rom. 1596.]

[The following extracts I have supplied from the sixth volume of the Vatican edition, A.D. 1596. I have the same extracts in a black letter edition of the Psalter, and also in a little Italian Manual of Devotion, issued under the auspices of Gregory XVI. They are important as authentic evidence of Romish idolatry.—J. C.]

Hymnus instar illius qui ascribitur Ambrosio et Aug.

Te matrem Dei laudamus, te Mariam Virginem profitemur.

Te æterni patris sponsam omnis terra veneratur.

Tibi omnes Angeli et Archangeli: tibi Throni et Principatus fideliter deserviunt.

Tibi omnes potestates et omnes virtutes coelorum: et universæ Dominationes obediunt.

Tibi omnes Chori, tibi Cherubim et Seraphim exultantes assistunt.

Tibi omnes Angelica creatura incessabili voce proclamant,

Sancta, sancta, sancta, Maria Dei genetrix mater et virgo.

Pleni sunt cœli et terra majestatis gloriæ fructus ventris tui.

Te gloriosus Apostolorum chorus, sui Creatoris matrem collaudat.

Te beatorum Martyrum cœtus candidatus, Christi genetricem glorificat.

Te gloriosus Confessorum exercitus, Trinitatis templum appellat.

Te sanctarum Virginum chorea anabilis, Virginitatis et humilitatis exemplum prædicat.

before all things it is necessary that he should hold a firm faith concerning the Virgin Mary; which faith except a man

Te tota cœlestis curia Reginam honorat.

Te per universum orbem Ecclesia invocando concelebrat.

Matrem divinæ majestatis.

Venerandam te veram Regis cœlestis puerperam, sanctam quoque dulcedinem et piam.

Tu Angelorum Domina, tu paradisi janua.

Tu scala regni cœlestis et gloriæ.

Tu thalamus, tu arca pietatis et gratiæ.

Tu vena misericordiæ, tu sponsa et mater Regis æterni.

Tu templum et sacrarium Spiritus sancti, totius beatissimæ Trinitatis nobile triclinium.

Tu mediatrix Dei et hominum, amatrix mortalium, cœlestis illuminatrix.

Tu agonizatrix pugnantium, advocata pauperum, miseratrix et refugium peccatorum.

Tu erogatrix munerum, separatrix, ac terror dæmonum et superborum.

Tu mundi Domina, cœli Regina, post Deum sola spes nostra.

Tu salus te invocantium, portus naufragantium, miserorum solatium, perentium refugium.

Tu mater omnium beatorum, gaudium plenum post Deum, omnium superiorum civium solatium.

Tu promotrix iustorum, congregatrix errantium, promissio Patriarcharum.

Tu veritas Prophetarum, præconium et doctrix Apostolorum, magistra Evangelistarum.

Tu fortitudo Martyrum, exemplar Confessorum, honor et festivitas Virginum.

Tu ad liberandum exulem hominem, Filium Dei suscepisti in utero.

Per te expugnato hoste antiquo, sunt aperta fidelibus regna cœlorum.

Tu cum Filio tuo sedes ad dexteram Patris.

Tu ipsum pro nobis roga virgo Maria, quem nos ad judicandum credimus esse venturum.

Te ergo poscimus nobis tuis famulis subveni, qui pretioso sanguine Filii tui redempti sumus.

Æterna fac pia Virgo, cum sanctis tuis, nos gloria munerari.

Salvum fac populum tuum Domina, ut simus participes hereditatis Filii tui.

Et rege nos, et custodi nos in æternum.

Per singulos dies o pia te salutamus.

Et laudare te cupimus usque in æternum, mente et voce.

Dignare dulcis Maria, nunc et semper nos sine delicto conservare.

Miserere pia nobis, miserere nobis.

Fiat misericordia tua magna nobiscum, quia in te virgo Maria confidimus.

In te dulcis Maria speramus, nos defendas in æternum.

Te decet laus, te decet imperium, tibi virtus et gloria in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

Cantate Dominæ nostræ canticum novum. P. 514.

Omnis spiritus: laudet Dominam nostram. Ibid.

Symbolum instar illius Athanasii.

Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est: ut teneat de Maria firmam fidem.

keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." And now, whosoever shall consider the Litanies of

Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit : absque dubio in æternum peribit.

Quoniam ipsa sola Virgo manens peperit : sola cunctas hæreses interemit. Confundatur et erubescat Hebræus : qui dicit Christum ex Joseph semine esse natum.

Confundatur Manichæus : qui dicit Christum fictum habere corpus.

Palleat omnis, qui hoc ipsum aliunde, non de Maria, dicit assumpsisse.

Idem namque Filius qui est Patris in divinis unigenitus : est et verus unigenitus Virginis Mariæ filius.

In cœlis sine Matre, in terris sine Patre.

Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro propter unionem de homine vere nascitur : ita Deus et homo Christus, de Maria Virgine vere generatur.

Induens carnem de carne Virginis : quia sic genus humanum redimi congruebat.

Qui secundum divinitatem æqualis Patri : secundum vero humanitatem minor patre.

Conceptus in utero Virginis Mariæ Angelo annunciante de Spiritu sancto : non tamen Spiritus sanctus est pater ejus.

Genitus in mundum sine poena carnis Virginis matris : quia sine delectatione carnis conceptus :

Quem lactavit mater : ubere de cœlo pleno.

Quem circumstant Angeli obstetricum vice : nunciantes pastoribus gaudium magnum.

Hic a Magis muneribus adoratus, ab Herode in Ægyptum fugatus, a Joanne in Jordane baptizatus : traditus, captus, flagellatus, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus.

Cum gloria resurrexit : ad cœlos ascendit.

Spiritum sanctum in discipulos, et in matrem misit.

Quam demum ipse in cœlum assumpsit : et sedet ad dexteram Filii, non cessans pro nobis Filium exorare.

Hæc est fides de Maria Virgine : quam nisi quisque fideliter, firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

Litania Beatæ Mariæ Virginis.

Kyrie eleison.

Christe eleison.

Christe audi nos.

Christe exaudi nos.

Pater de cœlis Deus, Mariæ conditor gloriosus,

Fili redemptor mundi Deus, Mariæ nobilis fecundator,

Spiritus sancte Deus, Mariæ mirabilis obumbrator,

Sancta Trinitas unus Deus, qui Mariam glorificas,

Sancta Maria, quæ totum mundum illuminas,

Sancta Maria, quæ tuos servos exaltas,

Sancta Maria, quæ pro peccatoribus supplicas,

Sancta Maria illuminatrix cordium,

Sancta Maria fons misericordiæ,

Sancta Maria splendor sanctæ Ecclesiæ,

Sancta Maria flumen sapientiæ,

Miserere nobis.

Miserere nobis.

Miserere nobis.

Miserere nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

Ora pro nobis.

the blessed Virgin, and other Rosaries, and the Prayers and Hymns of her Saturday's Office, and her Psalters, and the

Sancta Maria ab Angelo salutata,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria per Spiritum sanctum obumbrata,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria in coelis glorificata,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria rosa veris speciosa,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria vitis frondens generosa,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria dulcis virgo et speciosa,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria a Deo patre sponsa electa,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria verbi Dei mater praelecta,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria a Spiritu sancto protecta,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria, quæ Deum in utero concepisti,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria, quæ Deum et hominem genuisti,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virgo virginum signifera,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virga Jesse Christifera,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria arbor vitæ fructifera,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria feminarum pulcherrima,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria humilium humillima,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria sanctarum sanctissima,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria super omnes diligentius amanda,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria super omnes excellentius magnificanda,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater conditoris,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater redemptoris,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater salvatoris,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater mundo desiderabilis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria inferis terribilis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater amabilis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virgo plena gratia,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virgo plena clementia,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria pia fundens solatia,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria flos et decus virginalis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria fluvius sapientialis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria splendor et lux Orientalis,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virtutum cœli Regina,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria domus Dei cypressina,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria cœli fenestra crystallina,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria perpetuæ lucis aurora,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virgo pulchra et decora,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria melodia dulcis et sonora,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria deliciarum Dei dapifera,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria coelestis curiæ pincerna,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria paradisi porta pervia,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria placitum Dei umbraculum,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria virginum nova exultatio,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mulierum prima benedictio,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria miserorum pia consolatio,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria vera salus et beatitudo,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria charitatis magnitudo,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria pietatis latitudo,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mater orphanorum,	Ora pro nobis.

vast number of books of devotion to her, and the worship that is accordingly given to her in pretended Catholic countries ;

Sancta Maria mammilla orphanorum,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria mammilla parvulorum,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria consolatio afflictorum,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria cui Angeli obediunt et obsecrantur,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria nobilis Regina cœlorum,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria cui Sancti et Sanctæ congaudent et gratulantur,	Ora pro nobis.
Sancta Maria quam omnia laudant et venerantur,	Ora pro nobis.
Propitia esto,	Parce nobis Domina.
Propitia esto,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab omni malo,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab omni mala tentatione,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab ira et indignatione Dei,	Libera nos Domina.
A periclitatione et desperatione,	Libera nos Domina.
A superbia præcipitante,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab avaritia devastante,	Libera nos Domina.
A peccato iræ et invidiæ cruciante,	Libera nos Domina.
A carnis tentatione undique anxiantē,	Libera nos Domina.
A peccato gulæ et castrimargiæ commaculante,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab incurso hostis malignantis,	Libera nos Domina.
Per dulcorem et gaudium de Christi incarnatione,	Libera nos Domina.
Per dolorem et angustiam de illius passione,	Libera nos Domina.
Per gaudium et miraculum de illius resurrectione,	Libera nos Domina.
Per fidem tuam de Spiritus sancti missione,	Libera nos Domina.
Per gaudium et lætitiā de illius ascensione,	Libera nos Domina.
Per gaudium et lætitiā de tua coronatione,	Libera nos Domina.
In hora mortis devastante,	Libera nos Domina.
In iudicis districto examine,	Libera nos Domina.
Ab inferni horribili cruciamine,	Libera nos Domina.
Peccatores,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut sanctam Ecclesiam piissima Domina conservare digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut iustis gloriam, peccatoribus gratiam impetrare digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut tribulatus consolationem, captivis liberationem impetrare digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut famulos et famulas tibi devote servientes consolari digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut populum Christianum filii tui pretioso sanguine redemptum conservare digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Ut cunctis fidelibus defunctis requiem æternam donare digneris,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Mater Dei,	Te rogamus audi nos.
Mater charissima et Domina nostra, miserere nobis, et dona nobis perpetuam pacem, Amen.	Te rogamus audi nos.
Kyrie eleison.	
Christe eleison.	
Kyrie eleison.	

whosoever shall consider what they say to her in those prayers and hymns, &c. which the *Speculum Beatæ Virginis*, just now published, has put together, may perhaps find there are "causes of horror," which M. de Meaux is not so much concerned at as he ought to be: he may justly fear, that if the Reformation did not give some little check, neither would these excesses stop here, though in many places nothing now remains to be done, but without any farther reservedness, to erect altars proper to the blessed Virgin in every church, as the Jesuits* began to do in China.

Pater noster. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem.
 Ego dixi Domina miserere nobis.
 Sana animam meam, quia peccavi tibi.
 Converte misericordiam tuam super nos.
 Et deprecabilis esto super servos tuos.
 Ostende potentiam tuam contra inimicos nostros.
 Ut justificeris in nationibus populorum.
 Miserere servorum tuorum, super quos invocatum est nomen tuum.
 Et ne sinas angustari eos in tentationibus suis.
 Ne projicias nos in tempore mortis nostræ.
 Et succurre animam cum deseruerit corpus suum.
 Esto nobis Domina turris fortitudinis.
 Et petra durissima contra inimicum.
 Adjura me Domina, ne corruam coram eo.
 Fac ut coneratur sub pedibus meis.
 Exaudi orationem meam, et deprecationem meam.
 Et contempescant adversarii mei.

Oremus.

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui pro nobis de castissima Virgine Maria nasci dignatus es, fac nos tibe casto corpore servire, et humiliter placere.

Oramus etiam te piissima Virgo Maria, mundi Regina et Angelorum Domina, ut eis quos in purgatoris ignis examinat, impetres refrigerium, peccatoribus indulgentiam, et justis perseverantiam in bono: nos quoque fragiles ab omnibus instantibus defende periculis. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.

Psalm 50 [51].

Miserere mei Domina: quæ mater misericordiæ nuncuparis.
 Et secundum viscera misericordiarum tuarum: munda me ab omnibus iniquitatibus meis.
 Effunde gratiam tuam super me: et solitam clementiam tuam ne subtrahas a me.
 Quoniam peccata mea confitebor tibi: et coram te me accuso de sceleribus meis.
 Fructui ventris tui me reconcilia: et pacifica me ei, qui me creavit Gloria Patri, etc.]

* Trigautii Exp. ad Sinas. lib. 5. c. 15, 20.

O blessed God, look down in thy mercy upon the miserable estate of Christianity, in so many parts of the Christian world !

When the blessed Virgin foretold, "that all generations should call her blessed," did she mean that all generations should worship her ; would worship her images and pictures ; would make her a mediatrix between God and man ; would ascribe to her the power, not of prevailing with Jesus only for anything, but of commanding him too ; would offer Jesus himself a sacrifice in her honour ; would burn incense to her ; would use rosaries, hours, and psalters for her especial invocation and service ; would institute and maintain fraternities for that service ; would build temples and chapels to her, and altars, and by most solemn invocation everywhere, and by proper rites of religious worship, and by letting devotion run out to her more than to our Lord Jesus himself, to agnize her to be the "Lady of Heaven and Earth," "The Queen of the World?" No, she did not mean thus, in saying, that "all generations should call her blessed:" for thus "all generations" have not served her. Nothing of all this was done to her for several generations after Christ ; nor anything of it in comparison, till the dregs of time, till the decay of learning and piety made way for gross superstition.

The first beginnings of these corruptions were more general, but the improvements of them were chiefly owing to the See of Rome ; which, as it grew in power and greatness, so it protected those abuses more effectually : a character very ill-beseeming a Church that pretends to be the "pillar and ground of truth."

The wit of man could not devise anything more serviceable to error, to make it spread in the world, and to fix it, than that a powerful See grasping at supremacy, and pretending to infallibility, should take it under her wing.

This See is the source of all those oppositions, which they have met with that demanded a Reformation ; it is this See alone which hath obstructed a general Reformation, when Christendom was otherwise well disposed towards it.

Therefore when Reformation, by common consent, was made impossible by the See of Rome, what remained, but that the National Churches should reform themselves ?

Our Reformation was a return to primitive antiquity ; and that it may prove a leading example, let us pray without ceasing, that God "would bring into the way of truth all such as have erred, and are deceived."

THE TEXTS EXAMINED WHICH PAPISTS CITE OUT OF
THE BIBLE, FOR THE PROOF OF THEIR DOCTRINE CON-
CERNING THE WORSHIP OF ANGELS AND SAINTS
DEPARTED.

PART I.

CARDINAL BELLARMINE,* and other Romish authors, in their writings concerning the worship of angels and saints, tells us, that as there are three sorts of excellencies, so there are three sorts of worship due to them.

The first excellency is that which is in God only, infinite and supereminent above all; to which is to be paid a religious worship, called *Latria*.

The second is human or natural, to be found in men; and is subdivided into several sorts and degrees, according to the diversity of its objects, and degrees of their worth, whether it be prince, or parent, or master, or prophet, or philosopher; to which is to be paid a civil worship, called *Cultus Civilis*.

The third is a middle sort of excellency, betwixt divine and human, to be found in angels and glorified saints; to which is to be paid an inferior degree of religious worship, called *Dulia*: and because the Virgin Mary was the mother of our Lord, and far excelled all other saints, as well in favour with God, as in personal virtues and accomplishments; therefore to her is to be paid proportionably a higher degree of this sort of worship, called *Hyperdulia*.

The two first of these the Reformed own and consent to, but deny the last, as having no foundation in Scripture or reason, or true antiquity.

We worship God with all our hearts and souls, with the profoundest veneration, with the most raised affections, with the highest degrees of love and fear, and faith and confidence; and that not only as he is a God of infinite perfections, but as he is our absolute Lord and Sovereign, the Almighty Creator and all-wise Governor of all things.

We give to man too that worship that is suitable to his

* De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 12. [vol. 2. p. 400. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

finite and created worth and excellency ; God having, for the peace and order, and well-being of the world, constituted government in it, and made some the ministers of his Providence in conferring his blessings on mankind ; he hath also required an homage or worship to be done to them, conformable to the rank and order they stand in, and to that charge and power they are entrusted with.

But we do not think ourselves obliged to pay any worship at all to angels and saints, as that worship is distinguished from honour and esteem, and implies in it any power and dominion in them over us, or any dependance and subjection in us to them. And therefore, though we highly honour and esteem them, and manifest the inward sentiments of our hearts by suitable expressions, by blessing God for them, by commemorating their virtues and their martyrdom, by congratulating their victories over the world, by propounding their example to the imitation of others, by rejoicing in their happiness and glory : yet do we refuse to pay any worship or homage to them, much less that kind of worship and homage, which either divine institution, or the consent of nations, hath appropriated to God ; which, in its own nature, implies those perfections that are incommunicably in the Divine essence ; which, lastly, signify that trust and dependance upon them that ought wholly to be put in God. This is that which we charge upon the Church of Rome, and which her greatest champions can neither deny nor defend, though of late they have more bent their studies to hide her shame, than to justify it.

It is not enough that they give it a different name, when the worship is the same, that they distinguish the worship of God from that of the creature, by the intention of their minds ; ascribing the highest degree to the one, and a lower to the other, when they confound them together by making the external acts of it common to both : as God's being the universal parent and common benefactor of the world, challenges a public worship to be due to him ; so the unity of his nature, and the supremacy of his authority and power, require that that public worship, and all the expressions of it, be appropriated to him, as incommunicable as his nature, and undivided as his dominion ; the one ought to be singular and peculiar as the other, or else we put God and the creature on the level ; and either bring down God to the meanness of a creature, or exalt the creature to the altitude of a god.

But though no created excellency can have any inherent or natural right to any part of that worship that is given to God : may not God, who is the fountain of honour, make a grant of it to his beloved favourites, and permit at least, if not require, that some part of it be exhibited to them ? This is what the Romanists pretend to, but can never prove, as to any one of those particulars, wherein we accuse them of giving religious worship to angels and saints departed.

Some of those particulars they deny, but at the same time practise : they confess* that sacrifice is the peculiar worship of God, and ought to be offered to none besides ; it being written, *Exod.* xxii. 20, “ He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, shall surely be put to death.” And yet do they daily offer up Christ in the sacrifice of the mass to God, in honour of the saints, especially of the blessed Virgin : and how then is sacrifice esteemed by them an honour solely and peculiarly due to God ? They tell us also that† temples and altars, as well as sacrifice, are appropriate to God ; and yet what is more common amongst them, than to erect temples and altars in honour of the saints as patrons of them, and for their proper worship and service ?

Again, some they own, but do not pretend to prove from Scripture, but think to fetch them off by distinctions, whilst we have evident proofs from Scripture against them : such are burning incense and making vows to them ; concerning both which, the holy Scriptures inform us, that they are appropriate acts of worship to God.

For burning incense, *Exod.* xxx. 1, 8, 10 : “ Thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon, and Aaron shall burn incense upon it, a perpetual incense before the Lord, it is most holy unto the Lord :” and for this reason Hezekiah brake in pieces the brazen serpent, because the people burnt incense to it, *2 Kings* xviii. 4.

For making vows, *Numb.* xxx. 2 : “ If a man vow a vow unto the Lord.” *Deut.* xxiii. 21, 23 : “ When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God.” And *Isa.* xix. 21 : Vows are reckoned up with sacrifices and oblations : “ And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation ; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it.”

Lastly, others they both own, and have attempted to prove

* *Bellar. de Sanct. Beat.* l. 1. c. 12. [*Ibid.* p. 401.]

† *Bellar. eod. loc.*

from Scripture, such are the religious adoration and solemn invocation of them. My present business therefore is to examine what is the true sense of Scripture as to these points: which I shall do with as much care and judgment as I can, and with all faithfulness and sincerity; shewing the weakness of the proofs cited by the Papists in defence of them, and how very clear and strong ours are against them. For method's sake I shall cast them under these several heads.

I. Head.—*Although we do not deny that angels and saints departed pray for the Church on earth, yet many of the texts they cite for it do not prove it.*

II. Head.—*No proof from Scripture, that angels and saints departed have an universal knowledge of men, and their conditions.*

III. Head.—*No proof from Scripture that angels and saints departed are entrusted with the care and government of the world under God.*

IV. Head.—*No proof from Scripture for the religious adoration of angels and saints departed.*

V. Head.—*No proof from Scripture for the solemn invocation of angels and saints departed.*

I.

Although we do not deny, that angels and saints departed pray for the Church on earth, yet many of the texts they cite for it do not prove it.

We believe, as well as the Romanists, that angels and saints are in a happy and blessed state; that they have a very fervent charity, and a most tender concern for the Church on earth, and are always ready to do what they are able, especially by their good wishes and earnest prayers to promote its prosperity; that they are very dear to God, in great grace and favour with him, and likely to prevail in their intercessions for what things they ask according to his will; that they know very well what must be in general the necessities of a militant Church, the tribulations and persecutions it is subject to; that it is never without enemies, and consequently never without troubles; and knowing this, that they cannot but commiserate its state, and in pity and compassion towards it, pray for its relief and succour.

Farther ; though we do not make it an article of our faith, we look on it as a probable thing, that holy bishops and pastors, when they are gone to heaven, have in their prayers a particular regard to that part of Christ's Church over which they presided ; that other saints also in heaven may recommend the condition of their particular friends and relations unto God, with whom they lately conversed in the body, and whose wants they then were intimately acquainted with : so Gregory Nazianzen tells us, he believed concerning his deceased father,* "That he did especially intercede for that flock, over which he was bishop, and did them more good by his prayers now in heaven, than he did by his preaching when he lived amongst them." So the primitive Christians were wont to beg of the martyrs a little before they suffered, that when they came to heaven, and had received their crown, they would be mindful of them whom they left behind. Famous in ecclesiastical story is the agreement betwixt St. Cyprian and Cornelius,† that he which went first to glory, should particularly intercede for the other at the throne of grace.

This we lay down as probable : others have thought that they might go farther, and that it was no less likely, but that God may, on some particular occasions, and in some circumstances, depute an angel or saint to have the charge of such a particular person, or country, or city ; but that this was extraordinary and out of course.

Now thus much being granted, there is no need of proofs to make it good ; and yet some of those texts they produce for it are so little to the purpose, that were there no other, and those managed by no better hands, we should want sufficient motives to induce the belief of it. But they must be excused ; Scripture is a weapon they have not tried, nor used to fence withal. As for example, to give you a cast of their skill in expounding Scripture.

They endeavour to prove that the saints in heaven do pray for men on earth, from Jer. xv. 1 : "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people." Which words,‡ Bellarmine thinks, imply that Moses and Samuel could, and were wont to intercede for the people of Israel.

* Orat. 19. [vol. 1.] p. 288. [Par. 1630.]

† Epist. 57. [p. 206. Venet. 1728.]

‡ C. 18.

I answer, they do not necessarily so; for when St. Paul* says, "If an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel, let him be accursed;" he does not at all intimate, that an angel from heaven could or was ever guilty of it: but suppose they do, it does not follow that this was their custom since they went to heaven; for then, why did they not do it now, when there was most need, and the state of the Jews most deplorable? But that they often did it when they were here on earth. So that the plain sense of the text is this: the people of Judah had, by their sins, so highly provoked God to anger, that he had decreed their ruin, and the doom was irreversible; and this God was pleased to amplify by declaring that though he had oftentimes been prevailed with by those two holy men,† Moses and Samuel, when they were on earth, in the behalf of this people, to turn away his fierce anger from them; yet now the provocation was so great, that if they were alive again, and did intercede for them, it should not avail, and he would not be entreated for them. So St. Jerome and Theodoret expound them; "God spake of Moses and Samuel‡ as though they were living in the world, and were in their former station and condition;" and so they are explained by that parallel place,§ "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in the land, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God."

The next proof of theirs I shall take notice of, is by the way of inference, and not express in the text; it is in Rev. vi. 10: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Now, say they, if the souls of martyrs pray for vengeance on their persecutors and murderers, much more may we suppose them to pray for mercy and deliverance for their fellow-members and sufferers.

But they certainly frame a very odd notion in their minds of the blessed saints above, who think them so addicted to revenge and retaliation: can they, who, after the example of their Lord, prayed for their enemies when they were on the earth, and forgave their murderers, be supposed, now they are in heaven in a more perfect state, to pray for judgment and wrath upon them? The words therefore are figurative, and by this scheme of speech is signified unto us, not the desires

* Gal. i. [8.]

† Exod. xxxii. 11, 14.

‡ In locum. [Hieron. ut supra, vol. 4. p. 943.] [Theodor. vol. 2. p. 488. Hal. 1770.]

§ Ezek. xiv. 14.

and wishes, and prayers of the saints for vengeance on their enemies, but only the certainty of the Divine vengeance that would overtake them. By the souls of the slain crying under the altar, is meant their blood, and the sin of murdering them ; and as it is said that Abel's blood cried for vengeance ;* so the sin of shedding their blood cried, and would certainly awake and provoke the justice of God to take vengeance on them for it. The Fathers Ribera and Viegas so explain the text ; and a passage in the book of Esdras† gives farther light to it : " Behold the innocent and righteous blood crieth unto me, and the souls of the just complain continually, and therefore, saith the Lord, I will surely avenge them."

Another proof of theirs is from the corrupt reading of a text, and not the true sense of it, 2 Peter i. 15. The words are, " I am shortly to go out of this tabernacle, as our Lord himself hath declared unto me ; but I will endeavour that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance."

They read them, " I will endeavour after my decease," that is, say they, by his intercession in heaven for them. We read them, " I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease ;" that is, say we, by his diligence in instructing them while he was with them on earth. This is the true reading and natural sense of the words : St. Peter did not tell them what he would do for them when he was gone, but what should be his endeavour for them whilst he was here, *σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδόν*, not *σπουδάσω μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδόν*. And so St. Peter interprets himself in the words both before and after, ver. 12, 13 : " I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things ; it is meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance ;" and ver. 16 : " For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were‡ eye-witnesses of his majesty." Was there any need, this exposition might be confirmed by their own gloss, and many of their own authors on the place : but Bellarmine§ himself being not over confident that this text is for their turn, I may venture to dismiss it without any farther reflections on it.

From a corrupted text they proceed to apocryphal ones.

* Gen. iv. 10.

† Chap. 15.

‡ Dum vivo, Gloss. Dum vita suppetit, Cajet.

§ Non est argumentum evidens. Bell. c. 18.

2 Maccab. xv. 12, 13, 14, "This was his vision, Onias who had been High Priest — &c. prayed for the whole body of the Jews. This done, there appeared a man," &c. Onias said, "This is a lover of the brethren, who prayeth much for the people, and for the holy city, to wit, Jeremias, the prophet of God."

Now that which I would observe from this place (besides that it was but a dream of Judas Maccabæus, and the book of no good authority), is, that we do not find that Judas thereupon did either pray himself to them, or exhort the people to do it; but, ver. 22, directed his prayer to God alone; "Therefore in his prayer he said after this manner, O Lord, thou didst send thine angel in the time of Hezekiah:" and ver. 23, "Wherefore now also, O Lord of Heaven, send a good angel before us for a fear and dread unto them."

Again, they cite out of the Apocrypha, Baruch iii. 4: "O Lord Almighty, thou God of Israel, hear now the prayers of the dead Israelites." From whence they gather, that the dead Israelites prayed for the living.

But these words may have another sense fairly put upon them. And, 1. By the dead Israelites may not be meant those dead indeed, but whose condition was so distressed and desperate, as every moment to threaten death; and then the prayers of the dead Israelites were only the prayers of the Israelites that were ready to perish. And for this the verse before gives it, "we perish utterly." Or, 2. By the prayers of the dead Israelites, may be meant the prayers of their ancient worthies, which they, though now dead, put up to God when they were alive; to wit, the prayers of the patriarchs and prophets, when they were in the body, for the good estate of their posterity.

But what these texts fall short of, others may make up: in the 1st of Zech. 12, an angel is represented as interceding for the people of Israel. "And the Angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?" And yet by the angel here, the Jesuit Ribera* confesses, is meant Christ, the only advocate and intercessor in heaven for his Church and people, and backs his opinion with the suffrage of several of the Fathers, St. Jerome, St.

* Comment. in Heb. c. vii. v. 18.

Ambrose, Origen, and others. To which purpose we may observe, chap. iii. 2, that this angel is called the Lord. "And he shewed me Joshua the High Priest standing before the Angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right-hand to resist him; and the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem."

We believe also the communion of saints, and therefore it is a calumny that* Bellarmine puts upon us, where he says we deny it; but we believe withal, that that may be preserved betwixt the Church triumphant and Church militant, without our praying to them, or their meriting for us. The saints above, and those here below, make up but one body; they differ only in condition and degree; they in heaven, we upon earth; they in rest and peace from all their labours, we still beating it on the waves; they set safe out of the reach of sin and folly, we still struggling in the midst of temptations; but yet we are all of the same body: so says the Apostle, Heb. xii. 22, "Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." Now being of the same society with them, as we ought to honour their memories, to imitate their virtues,† to bless God for their examples, to be encouraged by the hopes of that salvation they now enjoy, and to pray for their perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul, in God's everlasting glory;‡ so no doubt do they bear a most tender affection to us, and have a hearty concern for our good, and do what, by the laws of that invisible world, they are permitted to do, especially by their earnest prayers, mightily prevalent with God, to procure our welfare. Communion with the saints in heaven thus far we own, and it may be proved; but that on this or any other account we are to worship them, we deny, and it can never be proved. However, the several texts cited by them to this purpose, I shall examine in the following heads.

* C. 18.

† Communion Office.

‡ Burial Office.

II.

No proof from Scripture, that angels and saints above have an universal knowledge of men and their conditions.

HERE the champions for the Papacy are at a great loss, and their doctors disagree ; they can neither prove that the saints have this knowledge, nor shew the way how they came by it ; they would fain put us off with may-be's and possibilities ; they tell us this may be done, and that it may be done this way or that way ; but can prove nothing, as any unprejudiced person will perceive, that considers the texts they produce for it.

The first and chiefest is St. Luke xv. 7, 10, "There is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth : " from whence they argue, that angels must know when a sinner repents, before they can rejoice at it ; and if they know that, why may they not know all other things concerning men ?

I answer : it does not follow, that because they know this one thing, they know any other, or all other things relating to men : this we believe they know, because our Saviour hath told us so ; but we have not the same reason to believe they have a general and universal knowledge of men, the Scripture being silent therein.

Possibly angels may know when a sinner repents these two ways.

1. By revelation from God ; knowing how much it would add to their happiness, and increase their joy, to see their fellow-creatures happy as well as themselves : God may be supposed as ready, by such an information from time to time, to augment their felicity, as they are to contribute to and rejoice in the felicity of others ; and this seems well enough to agree with the joy that the woman in the parable expressed at the finding of her lost piece of money ; she not only rejoiced herself, but called her friends and neighbours together to rejoice with her : Luke xv. 9, "Rejoice with me," saith she, "for I have found the piece which I had lost : " so may it be the goodwill of our heavenly Father, not only to take pleasure himself in the recovery of a lost sinner, but to communicate it to angels and blessed spirits, that they also might enjoy the satisfaction of so agreeable and welcome tidings.

2. By virtue of their ministry here below, for the good of

those that are heirs of salvation. By observing in men the signs and fruits of true repentance, they may come to know when a sinner is converted, and passing always betwixt heaven and earth, upon God's errands and embassies (as it was represented to Jacob in his divine vision), those that ascend from earth may tell the joyful news of it to them in heaven.

Possibly, I say, by these two ways angels may come to know when a sinner repenteth : but then, why may they not, by the same ways, know all other things concerning men ? Why, supposing that possible too, yet there is this great difference betwixt them, *viz.* we are told by our Saviour, that they do know the one, but we are not told that they know all the rest : and if " whatsoever is not of faith is sin,"* we having no foundation in Scripture to build our faith on, that they have an universal knowledge of men and their affairs, we must of necessity sin in believing it, or praying to them on that supposition ; and as there is no revelation in Scripture, that they have a general knowledge of men and their affairs, as well as of their repentance ; so neither is there the same reason that they should : God may reveal the one to them, as a thing he knew would administer to their farther pleasure and delight ; but for the same reason they may be kept ignorant of other things, and God withhold the knowledge of them from them, being such, it may be (and be sure our sins and vanities are such), as would redound more to their trouble and discontent than satisfaction.

But did this text prove, as you see it does not, that the blessed angels have an universal knowledge of men and their affairs, what is this to the saints departed ? These may be altogether ignorant of men, whilst the other, by virtue of their ministry on earth, may know many things concerning them. For this therefore they urge Matth. xxi. 20, that " the just at the resurrection shall be as the angels of God." Now this argument labours under the same weakness as the former ; as they proved before, that the angels know all things relating to men, because they know one thing, when a sinner repents ; so now they prove, that the saints in heaven are like to the angels in all things, because they are like to them in one. It is apparent that our Saviour spake of an equality in state and privilege, and not in knowledge and perfection of nature. The Sadducees that denied the resurrection of the dead, came

* Rom. xiv. 23.

to our Saviour, and thought to justify their atheism and infidelity, by putting a case to him, which they imagined would infer an unanswerable absurdity, were it granted that there was a resurrection. The case was this : a woman there was that had had seven husbands in her lifetime ; at the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of them all, for all had her to wife ? To which our Saviour answered, she shall be wife to none of them ; for in that other world, there is no more husband and wife, marrying or giving in marriage ; but men are like angels, that is, immortal as they, and shall not need matrimony to propagate their kind, and to supply their mortality, for they shall live for ever : “ they shall be as the angels of God,” not in every respect (for as they differ in nature and kind, so shall they have distinct natural qualities and operations), but in respect only of bliss and immortality.

Besides, supposing this equality was universal in every point, in nature and knowledge as well as bliss and happiness, the saints were not to have it till the resurrection. So it is said, “ at the resurrection the just,” &c. And does it follow from hence, that the saints are now what they shall be then ; that because at the resurrection they shall be as the angels, they are before the resurrection as the angels ?

This equality with the angels then will not do : Have they any more direct proof ? They think they have from our Saviour’s words, John v. 45, “ Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father ; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust.” But how, say they, can Moses, dead 2000 years ago, accuse those that were then living, if Moses did not know what passed here on earth ?

I reply, very well, if by Moses be meant (as it is in many other Scriptures) the writings or books of Moses. So Moses and the prophets signify, where Abraham thus speaks to Dives in hell : “ They have Moses and the prophets :” * not Moses and the prophets in the flesh, they being dead so long before, but Moses and the prophets in their doctrine. For the confirmation of this exposition, I might give you the judgment of the Fathers, † but it will be more than enough to set down Cardinal Cajetan’s words on the place : “ The Jews are accused by Moses, for that Moses’s writings condemn

* Luke xvi. 29.

† Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. l. 4. c. 4. [vol. 4. p. 528. col. 1. Par. 1759.] Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 14. [vol. 3. p. 37. Par. 1839.] Cyril. in Joh. l. 3. c. 8. [c. 2. p. 257. Lutet. 1638.]

them for not believing in Jesus: the Jews also are said to trust in Moses, because they trusted in the promises contained in Moses's writings, though they would not acknowledge the accomplishment of them in Christ." The Scribes and Pharisees, in the beginning of the chapter, take occasion from our Saviour's curing a lame man on the Sabbath-day, to rail at him as a Sabbath breaker and impostor. To which he answered, proving by many arguments that he was the Son of God, and commissioned by him to reform and to save the world: to this purpose he appeals to the testimony of John, chap. v. 32, 33, to the miracles he wrought, ver. 36, 37, and last of all, to their own law, the writings of Moses and the prophets, which they seemed so highly to prize, and so much to depend upon, ver. 39, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me:" and then tells them, that if after all this they did not own and believe on him, there was no need that he should accuse them to the Father; Moses, that is, the writings of Moses and the prophets would rise up in judgment against them, and condemn them; for in not believing on him, they declared they did as little believe what Moses had wrote, since he wrote of him; and therefore notwithstanding their high pretences of faith and zeal for Moses and the prophets, they were infidels as well to the law as to the Gospel, and threw as much dirt and contempt on their writings, as on his words, ver. 45, 46, 47, "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me: but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

Another text they allege in defence of this doctrine, is Rev. xii. 10: "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, The accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." Now, say they, the devils cannot accuse men, but they must first know for what; and if the devils know the actions of men, can we for shame deny it to the saints and angels?

To this two things may be returned. 1. That by the war in heaven, and the success of it, mentioned in these verses, from the 7th to the 11th, betwixt Michael and his angels on the one side, and the Dragon and his angels on the other, may be represented the conflict betwixt the Primitive Church and the Pagan emperors; the good and bad angels, after an invisible

manner, taking their respective sides, and opposing each other ; and then by the accusation the devil is continually presenting of the brethren before God, may be signified the wicked calumnies and abominable slanders of incests, adulteries, promiscuous lusts, murders, conspiracies against princes, and the like, that the infidels, by the devil's instigation and malice, raised against the Christians before the Emperor, and others the subordinate governors of provinces. 2. Though it be granted that the devil knows the actions of men, it does not follow that the saints and angels must do so too ; he being a little nearer to men on earth, than angels and saints in heaven are : he is called the "prince of the power of the air ;"* and is confined to this lower region, and therefore is often so near as to see and hear ~~men~~, though he is invisible himself : hence he is said to "go up and down like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour."† And when in the book of Job he is represented as coming before God to accuse and belie Job, and is asked by God, "Whence comest thou ?" he thus answered, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."‡

Now one would think that their proofs run low, and their cause is gasping, when they fly to a parable to support it ; and yet this they do, and lay great stress upon it. It is that of Dives and Lazarus, Luke xvi. from the 19th to the 31st verse. They tell us, that Abraham heard Dives calling to him out of hell, that he knew very well what a sensual luxurious life he had lived on earth, ver. 24, 25. Dives cried, and said, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me," &c.—And Abraham said, "Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things." Nay, that Dives in hell knew what was the condition of his brethren on earth, and the great danger they were in, and was so much concerned for their welfare, as to beseech Abraham to send or procure them a messenger from the dead, to persuade them to repent, ver. 28. "I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren ; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Is there not now as much charity in heaven as in hell ? and may not the blessed spirits above be supposed to be as much concerned, and as ready to forward the repentance and salvation of their brethren, as the damned beneath ?

* Eph. ii. 2.

† 1 Pet. [v.] 8.

‡ Job i. 7.

Here two things are to be considered :

1. That this, in all probability, is a parable, and so is not to be stretched too far, nor an argument to be drawn from every particular and circumstance in it : the proper use of parables is rather to illustrate than prove ; and if they conclude as to any thing, it is that only which is the main scope and design of them : now what our Saviour principally designed in this, is very obvious to any one that reads it ; it could be no other than to shew, that there remains no mercy, no hopes of salvation in the other world, no, not so much as a mitigation of torments ; and that no new revelation or miracle is to be expected thence for the conviction of those obstinate wretches, who would not be wrought upon by the means of grace they have already ; and therefore is not to be driven any farther.

2. But if they will argue from it as a real history (which must be confessed was the opinion of some of the Fathers), it proves too much, and more than they would have it, and so nothing at all.

As, (1.) That a spirit may have parts and members, since tongues, and eyes, and fingers are ascribed to Dives and Lazarus in the other world before the resurrection.

(2.) That the saints in heaven have not only a knowledge of our state and condition, but that they have this knowledge by their own natural power, that they see and hear us as Abraham did Dives ; for since Dives saw and heard Abraham, as well as Abraham Dives, it could not be by a supernatural gift, unless we can think the damned in hell also capable of it.

(3.) Whereas it is said, " Why may not the saints know what is done here on earth, as well as Abraham knew what manner of life Dives led when he was there ? " I answer, Abraham might be informed of this by Lazarus that lay in his bosom, who had been contemporary with Dives on earth, and an eye-witness of it : now because Abraham knew what was the conversation of one man on earth, must the saints in heaven have a general and universal knowledge of all men upon it ? and because Abraham might have this by particular information from Lazarus, may the saints come by it without any information that we know of ?

(4.) Whereas it is said also, that Dives knew the number and condition of his brethren, and shall we deny that privilege to the saints that is in some manner granted to damned spirits ? I answer, it might not be long since Dives had left this world and the society of his brethren, and so might well remember

them, and what their condition was; and if from hence they argue, that the saints in heaven retain the knowledge of their particular friends and brethren they left behind in this valley of tears, and remembering their wants and dangers, intercede for them at the throne of grace, I shall not need to oppose it, it being not to the purpose; but that the saints in heaven should have an universal knowledge of men, whom and whose condition they never knew, having left this world many hundreds of years before they came into it, because Dives in hell knew the state of his brethren, with whom he had lived on earth, and was not for any long time parted from them, is very strange reasoning, and what cannot be granted.

(5.) Again, whereas they say that Dives in hell had so much compassion for his brethren, as to endeavour and seek means to prevent their damnation; and shall we think the saints in heaven have less charity for their brethren, and are less concerned for their salvation? I answer, No. We believe the saints have a most tender love and concern for us; but we do not believe this for the sake of any argument drawn from the example of damned spirits; for we think they have no charity at all, but being in hell, are wholly of a hellish temper, made up purely of malice, and envy, and spite, without the least spark of love or pity, doing what mischief they can, and desirous to do more than they can, but having a perfect hatred to every thing that is good, or that has the least tendency towards it. And therefore Maldonate thinks, that the reason why Dives was so earnest to have a preacher of repentance sent to his brethren, was not so much out of charity to them, as love to himself; not so much to prevent their misery, as for fear of increasing his own, if by the wicked example he had given them, they also should come to that place of torment. Cardinal Cajetan gives another reason for it, but less probable, that Dives desired it out of pride and ambition, for the glory and exaltation of his family; having discovered such glorious things in heaven that Abraham and Lazarus enjoyed above what this lower world could boast of, he desired his brethren might rise to the possession of them, more to satisfy his proud and ambitious humour, than prompted to it by any compassionate and charitable disposition.

The last thing to be considered, is a passage in the Old Testament, which the Catholic Scripturist calls* a reserve, as

what he most depended upon : he thus delivers himself, "Elias departed out of this life the 18th year of King Jehoshaphat, 2 Kings ii. 11. Now Jehoshaphat reigned 25 years, 2 Chron. xx. 31. So that seven years of Jehoshaphat's reign passed after the departure of Elias. Then Joram his son reigned for him, 2 Chron. xxi. 12. After some time of this Joram's reign, there came a writing to him from Elias the prophet, saying, Thus saith the Lord, because thou hast not walked in the ways of Jehoshaphat thy father, &c. And then he tells him many particular acts of his, all done after Elias was dead. Elias therefore being departed, knew what passed, and shewed great care to help God's people, his brethren, in writing after his departure this letter."

This is his argument from these texts, and it was Bellarmine's and others of their doctors before him.

Against it I might, 1. Set the opinions of other of the learned men, that are contrary to this : as, that it was not Elijah the Tishbite, but some other of that name that sent this writing ; so Cajetan. That it was Elisha the prophet, under the name of Elijah, who succeeding him in his office, and being possessed with his spirit, might, as John the Baptist afterwards, be called by his name ; so Vatablus. That Elijah, by way of prophecy, wrote this letter before he was translated, and left it with Elisha, or some other good man, to have it conveyed to Joram. So a man of God prophesied of Josiah by name, long before he was born, 1 Kings xiii. 2. So did Isaiah of Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 1. And so might Elijah of Joram ; foreseeing by the spirit of prophecy, the abominable wickednesses that he would commit, and withal, that the fierce and wicked temper of his mind, would not admit any living prophet to come before him, wrote this letter before he left the world, to reprove him for his crimes, and foretel his doom. *

But waiving these, I doubt not, 2. but to make it appear, that Elijah was alive here on earth, when Joram was guilty of these murders and outrages. For it is very plain that Joram was made viceroy twice in his father's life-time ; after the last of which, he never resigned the crown back to his father. The first was about the 17th year of Jehoshaphat his father, on the occasion of his going with Ahab king of Israel to assist him in his war against Ramoth Gilead ; this is mentioned 2 Kings i. 17. The second about the 22nd year of Jehoshaphat, on a like occasion ; when at the solicitation of Jehoram king of Israel, he went with him to fight against Moab. Then again he sets

his son Joram in the throne, 2 Kings viii. 16. "In the fifth year of Jehoram, the son of Ahab king of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat began to reign." Now here it was that Joram, in his father's absence, thinking thereby to establish himself in the throne, began his reign with the barbarous slaughter of his brethren and princes of Judah; for it is apparent that Joram's eight years reign, 2 Chron. xxi. 5, began here, forasmuch as they are said to end with Jehoram king of Israel's twelfth year, 2 Kings viii. 25. It being the fifth of Jehoram that he was made king by his father, and the twelfth of Jehoram when he died, his reign must be reckoned to begin at that time. Now that this was done before Elijah the prophet was translated, appears in that Elisha was but newly come from being an eye-witness of his master's translation, when, by a miracle, he relieved the army of the three kings in Moab, who were ready to perish for want of water, 2 Kings iii. 11, and that that could not be till some considerable time after Joram was appointed viceroy by his father. So that it should seem, when Jehoshaphat first set out for the war with the other two kings, Elijah was on the earth; and hearing of Joram's cruelties, writes this letter to him, and immediately afterwards was taken up in a whirlwind. Thus the cruelties Joram acted, and the letter Elijah wrote to him on that occasion, were done in the interval betwixt Jehoshaphat's making him viceroy, and the armies wanting water. But Jehoshaphat made his son Joram king in the fifth year of Jehoram king of Israel, 2 Kings viii. 16. And Jehoram king of Israel began his reign in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat, 2 Kings iii. 1. So that Joram was made king by Jehoshaphat his father, about the 22nd of his reign; and if Elijah remained on earth to see or hear of the wickedness of Joram, he could not be translated till about the 22nd of Jehoshaphat; but the author of the Catholic Scripturist says, it was in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat, and cites for it, 2 Kings ii. 11. I answer, the Catholic Scripturist says so, but imposes on the reader, the text saying no such thing; it names no time, but only relates matter of fact: "And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that behold there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire; and he saw him no more, and he took hold of his own clothes and rent them in two pieces."

But as little proof as they have that the saints above have an universal knowledge of us and our condition, they will yet

be naming the way and means whereby they come to have it. The best of it is, they are all but possibilities grounded on the power of God, which we are far from denying: but say in answer to them, that it does not follow that God does do it because he can do it: especially when they cannot prove that God does do it, and we can that he does it not.

Four ways they lay down, whereby the saints may come to the knowledge of men and their conditions.

1. By information from the angels; and for this they make use of St. Austin's authority;* but what does St. Austin say? Why, only that it is possible they may hear something from angelical relation. But, 1. It is yet to be proved, that the angels themselves have by virtue of their ministers here on earth, or any other way, such an universal knowledge of us, as to be able to inform the saints as to every particular and circumstance of our state. 2. This spoils their argument taken from the equality of the saints with the angels; for if they have it at second hand from the angels, they are in this particular inferior to them from whence they had it. 3. This overthrows also their other argument,† that the saints hear our prayers after the same manner that the angels know the repentance of a sinner; for it seems the saints know our prayers from the report of the angels, but angels the conversion of a sinner, by being conversant amongst men, and observing the change. 4. The angels, by virtue of their ministry here on earth, cannot know the hearts of men, and their most secret desires; and therefore Bellarmine‡ rejects this way as insufficient. The angels cannot acquaint the saints with what they know not themselves; and yet every prayer that is put up to them, supposes they do know them, unless we can think they espouse the cause and request of their votaries at random, whether they are sincere or no. Nay, we are taught by the Council of Trent to put up not only vocal but mental prayers to them, that is, prayers without words or speech, only in the secret thoughts of our souls; and this necessarily supposes they know our thoughts and our hearts, contrary to the express words of Scripture: "He, even he knows all the hearts of the children of men," 1 Kings viii. 39. "It is he that seeth in

* *Possunt et ab Angelis, qui — et audire aliquid mortui.* De Cur. pro Mort. c. 15. [ut supra, vol. 6. p. 527.]

† *Unde sciunt Angeli conversionem peccatorum, inde sciunt Sancti nostras preces.* Bell. c. 20. [c. 19.] [vol. 2. p. 412. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

‡ *De Sanct. Beat. l. 20. [l. 1. c. 20.] [ibid. p. 418. col. 2.]*

secret," Matth. vi. 4. God challengeth it as peculiar to himself, Jer. xvii. 9, 10, "I the Lord search the heart and try the reins." No man can know the thoughts of a man's heart, but the man whose thoughts they are, unless God himself, who made and fashioned the heart of man, and is *intimior*, as the schools speaks, nearer to man than man can be to himself. 1 Cor. ii. 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?"

2. By a certain kind of inconceivable swiftness of motion, wherewith the angelical order may be endowed, and glorified saints also, being made equal unto them. But, 1. This equality betwixt the saints and angels in all particulars, was disproved before. 2. Bellarmine* himself confesses, that this celerity of motion is not sufficient; but that to the hearing of prayers put up at the same time in far distant places, it is requisite that the angels and saints should be present at the same time in every place. The angels and saints have a certain ubiquity and omnipresence belonging to them, or they have not: if they have not, it is confessed they cannot hear the prayers of men: if they say they have, they attribute that perfection to them, which their own authors own† to be above the condition of a creature; and the Scripture plainly tells us is God's peculiar, Psalm cxxxix. 7, 8, 9, 10, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

3. By the glass of the Deity, wherein all things are represented to their view that are in God. "They see all things, by beholding him who sees all things." But how then came the blessed angels, who always behold the face of God in glory, to be ignorant of the great work of man's redemption, till it was made known to them by the Church? 1 Pet. i. 12. How came they also to be ignorant of the day of judgment? Is not the day yet pitched upon by God? Does not God himself know it? Or do not they always live in the presence of God, and stand about his throne? "Yet," says our Saviour, "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, but the Father only," Matth. xxiv. 36. Nay, does not our Saviour let us know, that he himself as

* Bell. de Sanct. Beat. c. 20 [Ibid.]

† Bell. eod. loc.

man, though his humanity was hypostatically united to the divinity did not know it? "Neither the Son, but the Father." Luke xiii. 32. Accordingly their own authors tells us, that "this glass is not a necessary or natural glass, but voluntary, not naturally and necessarily exhibiting to their sight all things that are in God; for then the creature would comprehend God, and his knowledge be infinite like his, but only in that degree, and as to such things as God pleases." But how then are we to know what they do see in it, and what they do not? To what particulars their knowledge extends, and of what they are ignorant? And unless we did know this, with what doubts and uncertainties must we put up our prayers to them?

4. By revelation from God. And by this means indeed the saints in heaven may come to know our prayers and our hearts too: God can, if he pleases, reveal both to them. But how do they know God does or will at all times do it, when prayers vocal or mental are put up to them? It is not enough that God can do it, unless a promise can be produced that he will. He can tell my friend at Rome what I say in London; but I do not therefore believe he does do it. This Bellarmine tells us, is the manifest opinion of St. Austin:† whereas St. Austin‡ mentions it only as a probable way amongst others, and as to some things only: but if this was St. Austin's opinion, it seems it was not his: he confesses it is the fittest argument to convince heretics with, but dares not undertake for the reasonableness of it, unless the Church ordered, or at least gave leave, that before prayers are at any time put up to the saints, God be invoked to reveal and make known those prayers to them; his words are these, "If the saints need a new revelation every time they are prayed to, the Church were too bold to address to the saints to pray for them, before they had addressed to God to reveal their prayers to the saints."§

But has not God many times revealed secret things to his servants the prophets? Enabled them to know the hearts of men, and foretel future events? How came Samuel to know who Saul was, that he had never seen before? How came St.

* *Est enim speculum voluntarium. Biel. Non potest in ipso videre omnia, sed vel plura vel pauciora. Thom. Aq. pa. 1. qu. 12. Artic. 8. [vol. 20. p. 51. col. 1. Venet. 1787.]*

† *Apertissima Augustini sententia.*

‡ *Possunt Spiritus aliqua, spiritu Dei revelante, cognoscere. De Cur. pro Mort. [ut supra, p. 526.]*

§ *Si indigerent Sancti nova revelatione, &c. De Sanct. Beat. 1. 1. c. 20. [ut supra.]*

Peter to know how much Ananias and Sapphira sold the land for, when they had concealed the true price? How came Elisha the prophet to know what passed between his servant Gehazi and Naaman, at a great distance from him? How came the same prophet to tell the king of Israel all that the king of Syria did in his bed chamber, had not God revealed these things to them? And why may he not as well reveal to holy spirits in heaven, things that are done on earth? Ay, but it is still, why may he not? We want proof that he does. Besides, does it follow, that because he revealed some things to his prophets on earth, he now reveals all things to his saints in heaven? That because he revealed some things to his prophets on earth for the greater confirmation of their authority, and promoting the service of God they were sent about, he must now make such revelations to them in heaven, now the business of their vocation is over, and they have no need of such confirmation? Again, this is so far from being an argument, that God reveals to saints in heaven all things relating to us and our state, that it is an argument that he does not do it. For whilst he revealed some things to Elisha, he kept others hid from him; and though he acquainted him with the wickedness of Gehazi, he did not acquaint him with the death of the Shunamite's son, 2 Kings iv. 27, "Her soul is vexed within her, and the Lord hath hid it from me, and hath not told me."

To all this we may add, that as God has no where told us, that he does make known to blessed spirits the hearts and requests of men; so he has in effect told us, that he does not; else how could it be said of the good King Josiah, "Thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace, neither shall thy eyes see the evil I will bring upon this place?" 2 Kings xxii. 20. "The dead know not any thing," that is, of the affairs of this world, says the Preacher, Eccles. ix. 5. "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, and he perceiveth it not of them," says Job, of man in the other state, chap. xiv. 21. When Elijah was to be taken up into heaven, he thus spake to Elisha, "Ask what thou wilt, before I am taken from thee," 2 Kings ii. 9. Strongly implying, that when he was once gone, it was in vain to ask any thing of him; for could he have heard his requests in the other state, his capacity to gratify him must needs have been as great as it was here, being no less dear to God, and in his favour.

St. Austin makes use of two texts more to this purpose,* "When my father and mother forsake me, the Lord taketh me up," Psalm xxvii. 10. From whence he argues, that if our parents forsake us in death, how can they know or be interested in our affairs after death? And if our parents then have no knowledge of us, who amongst the dead beside can we imagine should? But if this text should be thought not so pertinently applied, the other is more without exception, Isa. lxiii. 16: "Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not." From whence he concludes, that if so great and famous patriarchs as Abraham and Isaac did not understand how the world went with their posterity after they were dead, why should we think that the dead are in any condition to administer relief and help to their surviving friends?

III.

No proof from Scripture that Angels and Saints departed are entrusted with the care and government of the world under God.

BELLARMINE tells us, that "the saints above are set over the Church, that they are gods by participation, that they are commissioned by God to take care of this lower world."† And these he endeavours to prove, 1. From texts that denote the ministry of angels in general. 2. From texts that denote the particular ministry of angels over particular persons. 3. From texts that denote the ministry of angels over particular provinces and kingdoms. 4. From texts that relate to us the appearance of some saints after they were dead. 5. From some metaphorical expressions the Scripture makes use of to display the glory and happiness the saints shall have in heaven.

1. From texts that denote the ministry of angels in general. The Apostle tells us, Heb. i. 14, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" And says the Psalmist, Ps. xci. 11, "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways."

But these texts only shew, that the angels in general do, by the command and direction of God, minister to good men,

* De Cur. pro Mort. c. 13.

† Præpositi Eccles. Dii. per participationem. Curam gerere rerum nostrarum. De Beat. Sanct. l. 1. c. 20. [ut supra, p. 419. col. 1.] de Cult. l. 3. c. 9. [Ibid. p. 500. col. 2.]

especially in times of danger and distress ; but that this their ministry is a sufficient foundation to worship them, does not at all appear from the texts, but rather the contrary ; for in Ps. xci. 15, the prophet, immediately after he had mentioned the protection and safeguard God affords his servants by the ministry of angels, subjoins a direction to whom we should apply for that protection ; and he does not send us to the angels, who are but God's ministers "that do his pleasure," but to God himself, their Lord and ours, and of the whole creation, who gives it them in charge, not saying if he calls upon them, they will succour him, but "he shall call upon me, and I will answer him ; I will be with him in trouble, I will deliver him, and honour him."

2. From texts that seem to intimate something concerning guardian angels over particular persons. The chiefest are, Dan. x. 13, "Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me : " and ver. 21, "And there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince." Matth. xviii. 10, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones ; for I say unto you, that their angels do always behold the face of my Father, which is in heaven." Acts xii. 13, St. Peter knocking at the door, they said, "it is his angel." And before, from ver. 7 to 12, "Now I know of a surety," says the Apostle, "that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me."

Now, (1.) from hence it does not follow, that all men in the world, whether Jews, or Turks, or wicked Christians, have a particular angel appointed by God to attend on them from the first to the last day of their lives, as is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but only the number of good men. Nor,

(2.) That good men have always one and the same angel to be their guardian, but that God may appoint now one or more, and at another time others. Nor,

(3.) That this attendance and ministry of theirs is constant and uninterrupted, but only on some special occasions, in times of danger, whether spiritual or temporal, of sin or suffering. Nor,

(4.) Taking it for granted, that every good man has a particular angel appointed by God as his guardian ; does it follow that he does any thing of himself, but all things by his direction and over-ruling hand, who ordered him to that particular service.

3. From texts that seem to intimate that God has set parti-

cular angels over particular countries and provinces to govern and defend them. These are chiefly two; Dan. x. 20, 21, where mention is made of the Prince of Persia, and the Prince of Græcia, and Michael the prince of God's people. The other is Deut. xxxii. 8, which some of the Church of Rome would have to be read thus, "When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God ; κατὰ ἄριθμον τῶν Ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ."

To the first of these it will be enough to say, that this was a vision of the Prophet's, and that there is no more reason to build an article of faith on every circumstance in it, than on those in a parable ; we may as well conclude that the touch of an angel is necessary to the inspiring of a prophet, because it was so done to Daniel, ver. 10, or that it is in the power of an evil angel to hinder a good angel in the executing his office God has appointed him to, because (ver. 13,) it is said, that a good angel sent by God to comfort Daniel, was withstood by an evil one, one and twenty days ; as that all the kingdoms of the world have a particular guardian angel to preside over them, because here is mention made of the princes of Persia, and Græcia, and of God's people. Not here to dispute, whether by the princes of Græcia and Persia are meant angels, or the kings of those countries ; or if angels be meant, whether they were good or bad ; or whether by Michael be meant a mere angel, or Christ ; the most that can be gathered from them is, not that those angels are commissioned by God to have under them the settled government of those countries, but that God thought fit to send them at that time on that particular employment.

To the other text in Deuteronomy, I shall only observe, that it is a corrupt reading of the text according to the LXX., who, as it should seem, were infected with the heathen doctrine of dæmons governing the world under the supreme God, and that the Hebrew text has them as we translate, "He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel."

4. From texts that shew, that saints departed have afterwards appeared on the earth. So they tell us, Moses and Elias were sent to attend on Christ at his transfiguration on Mount Tabor, and many others appeared at his resurrection ; and why may not they and other saints be employed by God in other services and ministries on earth for the good of his

Church?" Matth. xvii. 3, "There appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him" Matth. xxvii. 52, "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

Yes, God may do this if he pleases; but they are to prove that he ordinarily does do it. These were singular and extraordinary dispensations, and no general conclusion can be drawn from one or two particular instances, that because God once or twice employed saints departed on a special occasion, he frequently and ordinarily employs them on all occasions. God may, if he thinks fit, dispense with or empower one or more of that heavenly body in some certain cases and times, to minister to some affairs and some men; but on this cannot be raised an article of faith, that the souls of the righteous are usually conversant amongst men, and have the custody of them committed to their care.

5. From texts wherein the excelling glory and happiness of the Apostles and other eminent saints at the day of judgment, is lively set forth by high and suitable metaphors: such are Rev. ii. 26, "He that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken."

I do not think these words are to be meant of that miraculous power and spirit God gave the Apostles and first bishops of the Church, wherewith they were enabled to convert the heathen world, and bring them over to Christianity, as some learned men have expounded them: but as those words, "He that keepeth my works unto the end," limit the sense as to place, to the other world, and the glory and happiness those faithful servants of Christ shall partake of in heaven; so those other that follow, "and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a potter they shall be broken to shivers," limit it as to time, and shew, that they are not to enter upon this part of their glory till the resurrection, when they shall come with Christ to judge the world, and condemn the wicked. And because the saints, as members of Christ their Head, and attendants on his throne, shall partake of his splendour and majesty, when he appears with them to judge the world; therefore is that judgment he shall then exercise over all mankind, and the dreadful sentence he shall then denounce against the ungodly, in some sense attributed to them: "They shall judge

the nations, and have dominion over the people, and their Lord shall reign for ever," Wisd. iii. 8. "Ye that have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Matth. xix. 28. "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?" 1 Cor. vi. 2. "He cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment on all, and to convince all of their ungodly deeds," Jude, ver. 14, 15.

But Bellarmine tells us, that the iron rod does not here signify a judicial, but only a pastoral rod; and so the power and authority here conferred on the saints is, "to rule and govern," and "not to judge and punish the nations;" and consequently must be meant of a power the saints shall exercise before the resurrection, and not after, when the world shall be at an end, and there be no nations for them to exercise dominion over. And this he endeavours to strengthen by adding, that the word in Psalm ii. 9, (from whence this text is taken) signifies in the original, to feed or govern, and is by the Septuagint translated ποιμαίνει, *pascet*; and that the Psalmist speaks there of Christ's whole inheritance, which he cannot be said to punish and destroy; he rules all, but condemns only the obstinate and rebellious; as also in Rev. vii. 5, the woman in the wilderness is said to bring forth a son, that shall rule all nations with a rod of iron. But says he, "Christ does not punish and condemn all nations, though he rule them all."

To this it is answered, 1. That though rod, put by itself, is in Scripture applied to a pastoral government, as Micah vii. 14, "Feed thy people with thy rod;" yet to rule with a rod of iron, is always, in the Scripture, taken in the worst sense, not to rule or govern, but to inflict punishment, and that with great severity: such are the strokes of an iron rod, that give the smartest pain, and cause the deepest wound. So in Psalm cxlix. 8, "Let a two-edged sword be in their hands, to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron." Deut. xxviii. 48, "Thou shalt serve thine enemy, &c. and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee." Deut. iv. 20. The affliction and bondage of the Jews in Egypt is, for the heaviness of it, called an iron furnace; "The Lord brought you out of the iron furnace." And therefore the Septuagint, and Bellarmine from them, were mistaken in translating the word in the 2nd Psalm, to "rule or feed," (when it is not *tirem*, *pascet*, but *teroem*, *franges*, or *conteres*),

not thou shalt rule, but as we rightly render it, "thou shalt break them with a rod of iron." Accordingly the words in Rev. xii. 5, "He shall rule all nations with a rod of iron," are explained by those in Rev. xix. 15, "Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."

2. The Prophet does not speak in the 2nd Psalm of breaking his inheritance with a rod of iron, but the heathen; "he shall bruise them," not it, *viz.* those of the heathen who would not become Christ's inheritance; and therefore it follows, and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel;" both passages are spoken of the same subject; and if his inheritance cannot be meant in the latter, neither in the former: the true sense of the words is, that Christ's dominion should become so large and universal, as to reach to all the nations of the world; and withal so powerful and irresistible, that those amongst them that would not bow and submit to his golden sceptre, his righteous and merciful government, should be broken and dashed in pieces by his iron rod, by his terrible and insupportable judgments; suitably hereunto the "all nations," mentioned in Rev. xii is to be understood of heathens and infidels; for so the Jews were wont to call all that were not of their own country, Gentiles or nations.

Having been so long in setting this text in its true light, I shall not need to say much in the explication of the rest cited by them to this purpose. Thus when it is said, Rev. iii. 12, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God," the meaning is, he shall in a high degree be blessed and glorious in the kingdom of heaven, answerable to the eminent degree of service he has done for Christ and his Church, and the victories he has wrought over the heathen and idolatrous world, vanquishing the prejudices, and triumphing over the lusts of men, converting them to Christianity: "He shall be as a pillar in the temple of my God:" he shall shine as bright in heaven, and be as immoveably fixed in glory, as the two pillars in Solomon's temple,* Boaz and Jachin, that were the illustrious grace and ornament of it. As he was a pillar in the Church on earth, remaining himself unshaken against all the winds of heresy, and storms of persecution, and sustaining and confirming others by his doctrine and example; so in

* 1 Kings vii. 21.

heaven shall his reward and glory be answerable,* “having turned many to righteousness, he shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever.” Famous in story are Trajan’s and Antoninus’s pillars, on which were engraven the account of their several victories and triumphs; and some tell us, that on those pillars in the temple did Solomon cause all the magnanimous acts of his father David to be recorded; so that “to be a pillar in the temple of God,” is to receive the honour, and renown, and immortality that is due to a mighty conqueror.

And this also is the meaning of the 21st verse of the third of the Revelation; “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne;” that is, he shall be admitted into heaven, which is called the throne of God, Isa. lxvi. 1, and partake of my glory and exaltation, as he did of my cross and sufferings. “As I overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne;” that is, as my Father was pleased to exalt me, as the reward of my perfect obedience and sufferings, to his right hand in glory and majesty; so they, who through the power of my grace and spirit, shall be conquerors over sin, the world, and the devil, shall, as the reward of their labours and victories, be exalted to the same place, and, according to their capacities, partake of the same glories and triumphs. Hence, saith the Apostle, “If we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with him,” 2 Tim. ii. 12; and “he hath made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus,” Eph. ii. 6.

Of the like nature and meaning is that in St. Matth. xxiv. 45, 46, 47: “Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods.” Our Saviour here alludes to a servant or steward, who having, by his care and faithfulness, deserved well of his master in the discharge of that trust already committed to him, had, for his reward, a larger commission, and an higher place bestowed upon him; suitable to those other words of our Saviour, in the parable of the talents, Matth. xxv. 14, “For as much as thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.” So Luke xix. 12, He that improved his pound to five, had authority

* Dan. xii. 3.

given him over five cities ; and he that improved his to ten, had authority given him over ten cities : he alludes, saith Maldonate,* to the "manner and custom of kings, who were wont to reward the faithfulness of their subjects in smaller offices, by giving them commands over cities and provinces." But here it is to be observed, that this recompence and retribution for their good services, was not made till the Lord in the parable returned from his long journey, and called together his servants to give an account of their stewardship : by which is signified unto us, that whatever height of glory and dignity is represented to us by those metaphors and phrases, it shall not be conferred on the saints till after the resurrection, when our Lord shall return to judge the world, and reward every man according to the kind, and according to the degree of his work.

From all these texts it is very evident, that as God makes use of angels, not as governing spirits, but as ministers of his will, and instruments of his providence ; so he makes not use of saints departed at all. The Scripture assures us, that the least thing in the world,† "the birds of the air, and the hairs of our head," fall under God's care and inspection ; and in opposition to the heathen idolatry, who ascribed the government of the world to the lieutenancy of demons under the supreme God, that there is "but one God and one Lord," 1 Cor. viii. 5. Again, to draw men off from this belief, and from worshipping of them, St. Paul, Acts xiv. 15, puts them in mind of the testimony God had given them of his providence, in sending them fruitful seasons : and if the supplies of outward blessings are owing to God's immediate care over men then are they not obliged for them to any commissioned demons or angels that govern under him.

The prophet Isaiah, in many places of his prophecy, chap. xli. 22. and chap. xliii. 11, 12, 13, and chap. xlv. 5, 6, 7, assures us, that God is the great disposer of good and evil in all cities and places. So that nothing is more apparent, than that God has the concernment of the whole creation under his eye, and keeps the disposal of all things in his own hands, and that all things are done with his permission, if not by his order and appointment ; he then must be the only object of our hope and trust, our praises and thanksgivings, who is the author and donor of all our blessings ; and if angels are not

* In locum.

† Matth. [x. 29, 30.]

to partake with God in our prayers and praises, whose ministry God sometimes makes use of in the dispensations of his providence towards the sons of men, much less the saints departed, concerning whose ministry on earth for their good, the Scripture says not so much, says nothing at all, nay speaks against it. Revel. xiv. 13, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, they rest from their labours." And St. Paul, speaking of the prophet David, Acts xiii. 36, says, "After he had served his own generation by the will of God, he fell on sleep:" which implies, that after he had served God in his generation, and was gone to heaven, that service was over, and he was no longer to be employed in such ministries.

PART II.

IV.

No proof from Scripture for the religious adoration of angels and saints departed.

By religious adoration, I do not mean the bare act of adoration, which, without blame, may and has been given in common to God, angels, and men; but adoration with such circumstances of religion, whether as to time, or place, or occasion, or the absence and invisibility of the object, wherewith divine institution, or the custom of the world, has directed and prescribed God to be worshipped: for this the Romanists have no proof in Scripture, as will appear by examining the texts they produce for it.

The first is Gen. xviii. 2, where it is written, that "Abraham seeing three men stand before him, ran to meet them, and bowed himself towards the ground."

To this the answer is obvious, that this was only a civil respect or reverence that was customarily paid in that country from man to man; Abraham taking them to be no more than men, and making provision for them accordingly; ver. 5. "I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts:" and this the Apostle favours in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xiii. 2, where exhorting to hospitality, he uses this as an argument, that some thereby have "entertained angels unawares;" that is, have entertained angels whilst they thought

them to be but men. I might here add, that some have thought it most likely, that one of those three angels was the Son of God, the "Angel of the Covenant," as it is called Mal. iii. 1; and "the Angel of the great Council,"* as the Septuagint have it in Isa. ix. 6. And so the† Fathers expound the text, observing that in many verses of this chapter, the angel that for some time after held discourse with Abraham concerning the destruction of Sodom, is called by that incommunicable name of God, Jehovah, styled by Abraham, the "Judge of all the earth," ver. 17, 20, 22, 26. But this hinders not but that Abraham at first thought them all three to be men; nor is there any circumstance in the text, that speaks the respect he shewed them, to be any more than civil.

Bellarmino's next proof is from Gen. xix. which he does not much insist on, but others thus improve, telling us, that Lot is not only said to worship the two angels that came to him, "bowing himself with his face towards the ground," ver. 1; but, 19, 20, to make supplication to them in the behalf of Zoar, that that might be spared as a refuge to him and his family from the storm of fire that was coming on those cities.

To this, the same answer in effect is to be given; that Lot at first apprehended them to be no other than men, and that the prostration he paid them, was only an expression of civil respect and honour to them: though afterwards, as in the former instance, he might come to understand, that one of these two angels was also the eternal Logos, the Son of God; to which purpose it is to be observed, that Lot, ver. 19, makes his application only to one of them, and owns him to be the author of his safety and deliverance; and the very form and strain of the thanksgiving declares the person it was offered to, more than a creature; "Behold now thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy that thou hast shewed me:" or as the vulgar Latin hath it,‡ "thou hast magnified thy glory and thy mercy," &c. Again it is said, that the angel heard his petition, and accepted him concerning Zoar, ver. 21, which he could not have done, nor had it been any more in his power to have spared Zoar, than

* Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος.

† Constant. Mag. ad Macar. Epis. Hieros. in l. de vit. sua apud Euseb. c. 50. [c. 53.] [ut supra, p. 510.] S. Hil. l. 4. de Trinit. [vol. 2. p. 91. Veron. 1730.]

‡ Magnificasti Gloriam et Misericordiam.

the rest of the cities, had he been no more than an angel. And it should seem, that it was the same angel that spared Zoar, that is said, ver. 24, "to rain fire and brimstone" upon the rest, and is there called the Lord Jehovah in the original; for it immediately follows, after Lot's petition for Zoar was granted, "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven."

But Bellarmine lays not so great a stress on these two, as on that that follows; for says he, if it should be said, that Abraham and Lot thought at first that these angels were no more than men, and so the worship was no more than civil, that was exhibited to them; the like cannot be said of Balaam's worshipping the angel, who knew him to be an angel when he worshipped him; and now says he,* "it is ridiculous to say, that it is a civil honour that is paid to angels." Numb. xxii. 31, "Then the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face."

I shall not stay here to determine, whether Balaam was a Prophet of God, or only a heathen soothsayer; each opinion has its learned patrons; it is evident he was an ill man, and had a covetous mind; that if he had not been powerfully over-ruled by the Spirit of God, he had been corrupted by the glorious promises of reward that Balak made him, and that when God would not suffer him to curse his people Israel, he taught Balak a way how to bring a curse upon them, by tempting them to sin and folly,† to "eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication with the daughters of Moab."

Now, 1. The mere example of such a man cannot be thought sufficient to justify and secure the goodness of any action.

2. The bowing and prostration was a token only of honour and respect, as is due to all creatures proportionable to the worth and excellencies they have received from God; and if it be ridiculous to call this, as Bellarmine tells us, civil worship, I will not quarrel with him for a word, provided it be owned to be a worship different from religious, and is not called by that name: and yet after all, I know no reason why I may not shew an honourable respect and esteem to an angel that appears to me on the earth, as well as to a prophet, or

* *Angelis ridiculum est dicere deberi civilem honorem.*

† Numb. xxv. 1. Rev. ii. 14.

an eminent philosopher : nay, why I may not pay such a kind of worship to him, if sent to withstand me in an evil way, as I may and ought to a magistrate, who is ordained by God to be a terror to evil works, “a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.”*

3. There are those who will have this angel to be the same mentioned in Bellarmine's next instance, that appeared to Joshua, *viz.* “the captain of the Lord's host,” who also appeared with his sword drawn in his hand, as this to Balaam.

I pass therefore to consider that text, Josh. v. 13, 14, where Joshua is said to fall on his face to the earth, and worship the angel that appeared to him. This must be confessed to be religious worship, from the words that follow, ver. 15, where the angel bids him, “loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground ; and Joshua did so.”

But then we are to observe, that Joshua did not fall down and pay this homage and worship to him at first, till he had told him that he was the captain of the Lord's host. “As captain of the host of the Lord am I come,” ver. 14. And to whom can that title, with any show of reason, be attributed but to the Son of God, who before appeared to Moses in a flaming bush, Exod. iii. 1, 2, required the same expression of worship to be paid him, ver. 5 : “Put off thy shoes from off thy feet,” and is called the Lord Jehovah in many places, both in the 3rd and 4th chapters ; who also was the angel that went before the children of Israel, and led them through the wilderness ; and therefore says the Apostle, 1 Cor. x. 9 : “Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.” In which words, says the Jesuit Salmeron,† “the Apostle intimates to us Christ's divinity, forasmuch as he was the peculiar leader and conductor of the Israelites :” to all which we may farther observe, that he who in chap. v. 14, calls himself the “captain of the Lord's host,” is, in chap. vi. 2, called Jehovah. “And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thy hand Jericho.”

From attempting to justify their adoration of angels, Bellarmine proceeds to cite places for the religious adoration of holy

* Rom. xiii. 3, 4.

† Signanter dicit Apostolus (ne tentemus Christum, &c.) Divinitatem Christi insinuans, nec immerito, quia Christus Deus erat peculiaris ductor illorum, &c. disput. 17. [vol. 14. p. 136. col. 1. Colon. Agr. 1604.]

men and prophets. And his first is, 1 Sam. xxviii. 14, where Saul is said to worship Samuel, raised up by the witch of Endor. "And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face towards the ground, and bowed himself."

That this ghost was the devil in Samuel's shape, and not Samuel himself, many of the Fathers have plainly asserted; "as the devil," says Tertullian,* "sometimes transforms himself into an angel of light, here by God's permission he put on the shape of a man of light." The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus† is indeed of the other opinion, chap. xlv. 20: "After his death he prophesied, and shewed the king his end, and lift up his voice from the earth in prophecy:" and the Church of Rome having received that Apocryphal book with the rest into the canon of Scripture, the Romish doctors do also eagerly contend for it; but it is not likely that the souls of the saints, who, as we read, "are in God's hands," should be so much under the devil's power, as to be raised and disturbed by him at pleasure; or that God, who had refused to answer‡ Saul by dreams, or by Urim, or by his prophets, the ways he himself had appointed, should now gratify him, when by unlawful and forbidden ways he came to inquire of him.§

But be it so, that Saul took him to be Samuel himself: I answer, that either there was no more in Saul's gesture of stooping and bowing before him, than only a testimony of respect and honour, such as was due to him on the account of his being a prophet, and a holy man, and which Saul had or might have paid to him when alive; or, if there was any thing of religion in it, it was more than it ought to be, and what no example, much less the example of an ill prince, and one forsaken by God, can justify.

The like may be said of Obadiah's falling on his face and worshipping Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 7: "And as Obadiah was in the way, behold Elijah met him, and he knew him, and fell on his face and said, Art thou that my lord Elijah?" It cannot indeed be called properly a civil worship, Obadiah being a great man, and superior to Elijah in power and authority; but then, neither was it strictly speaking any worship at all, but a token of honour and esteem shewn him

* Just. Mart. Qu. 52. [p. 461. Par. 1742.] L. de Anima, c. 33. [c. 57.] [ut supra, p. 306.]

† St. Aust. tom. 4. quæ. 27. [ut supra, vol. 3. Append. p. 51.] Greg. Nyas.

‡ 1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

§ Deut. xviii. 11.

on the account of his office and holiness, and not of superiority or dominion.

The last instance mentioned by Bellarmine, is somewhat more difficult, *viz.* Dan. ii. 46, where we read, that Nebuchadnezzar worshipped Daniel, “and commanded that oblations and sweet odours should be offered unto him.” Where the offering oblations and odours being enjoined with adoration, they would needs have to be religious worship. But,

1. These oblations and odours might not be sacrifices, but only presents made to Daniel: the words in the original *Mincha*, and *Nichochin*, signifying at large not only sacrifices and incense, but gifts and sweet odours; and then the whole action was no more than honorary, and what Daniel's extraordinary spirit and gift of prophecy, might justly challenge from the greatest of men.

2. If those oblations and odours were proper sacrifices (as some think they were, because the word in the original *Lenasuca*, is more properly rendered, to be sacrificed, than offered to him; and so the vulgar Latin has it,* that they should sacrifice an oblation and sweet odours unto him, to which the Romanists are bound to stand), either Daniel accepted of them, or he did not; if he did, then he took more than was due to him, “sacrifice, according to them, being peculiar to God” (therefore Bellarmine, aware of this, will have them not to be sacrifices, but only gifts or presents), and then his example does not warrant the action: or he did not, and then the offering it by a heathen prince, who after the manner of his own religion (and as the men of Lycaonia would have done to Paul and Barnabas†), would have worshipped him as a God, cannot make it lawful, while it was refused by the prophet. And though it is not said expressly, he refused it; yet may it be gathered from the coherence of the chapter, and is favoured by great men of the Church of Rome; for it seems probable enough, that after the king, ver. 46, had fallen down to worship Daniel, and commanded an oblation and sweet odours to be offered to him, that Daniel forbade it, and advised, that they should be offered to God, as a principal part of that worship that was peculiar to him, repeating to him the words of the 28th verse; “There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king what shall be hereafter:” and this may be very well conjectured, in that the next verse, the

* Ut sacrificarent ei.

† Acts xiv. 13.

47th, begins thus : " The king answered unto Daniel ;" which intimates, that Daniel had said something since the king spake to him in the 46th verse, and commanded him to be worshipped. Also in that the king's answer seems to be a repeating of what Daniel had said in reply to the king, when he commanded his servants to sacrifice to him ; which is, in effect, the same with the 28th verse, " Of a truth it is," answers he, consenting and repeating as it were, what Daniel had spoke last, " that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldst reveal this secret." For this opinion, I could produce the testimony of no less than three Jesuits, Sanctius, Pererius, and Maldonate ; the last of which is very positive, " That the Prophet refused the honour offered to him ; the Scripture not saying that he accepted it, but only that the king offered it."*

Having thus shewn the insufficiency of their proofs for the religious adoration of saints and angels, it will not be amiss to set down those that plainly and expressly forbid and condemn it ; amongst many, these five are not the least considerable. It is the first commandment God gave on Mount Sinai, Exod. xx, " Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This God oft-times reinforced by his servant Moses, Deut. vi. 13, and chap. x. 20, " Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him." And if our blessed Saviour may be allowed to be a good interpreter of God's law, those words confine all religious worship to God alone. For so he replies to the devil, and at once quotes and explains that text, in Matth. iv. 10, " It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." It is not enough here to say, that the word *only* is to be restrained to the latter word *serve*, and does not at all belong to the former word *worship* : when it was to *worship* him, that the devil demanded of our Saviour, ver. 9, " All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." And if these words, " Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," are not to be understood exclusive of all other beings, they had not been an answer sufficient to the devil's demand, who might have returned, thou mayest worship God and me too.

Nor is it at all to the purpose to say, that by those words is only forbid the highest degree of religious worship, *Latria*, to

* Ego asseveranter affirmo, Prophetam oblatum honorem recusasse, neque enim Scriptura dicit, quod ille acceperit, sed quod illi rex obtulerit.

be given to other things, when it was not that but a lower degree that the devil required. The highest degree of religious worship, which they call "*Latria*, is," says Bellarmine,* "always accompanied with the apprehension and acknowledgment of God, as the first principal and ultimate end of all things, and consequently as the chiefest good." But it is apparent, the devil did not claim this, he acknowledged the sovereign and almighty power of God, "that it was he alone that could make stones to become bread," ver. 3. He acknowledged the power he had of disposing of all the kingdoms of the world, was not by any natural right, but derivative and by way of grant; "They were delivered to me," says he, Luke iv. 6. And thus owning himself not to be the Supreme Being, he cannot be supposed to claim the supreme or highest degree of worship. The devil then challenging but an inferior worship, our Saviour's answer must be supposed to forbid that too, as well as the highest, or else it can by no means pass for an answer. So much also the very words and phrase intimate, "If thou wilt fall down and worship me," or by falling down worship me; the devil would have been content with the external act only, with any degree: he might have kept his heart for God, so long as he had bowed his body in token of subjection to him. This therefore must be forbid in our Saviour's answer, or else it does not reach the case and the thing demanded.

But the words being an answer to the devil's demand, may they not be restrained to a prohibition only of worshipping devils and evil spirits? I answer, the words run in the largest and most general expression, and the reason given why God is to be worshipped, holds as strong against the worship of good spirits, as evil: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," for this reason, because he is the Lord thy God: now good spirits are no more the Lord our God, than bad ones are.

St. Paul's caution and prohibition is no less to be heeded, Col. ii. 18: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head."

"In a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels:" it

* *Latriam esse quandam summam voluntatis prostrationem et inclinationem, cum apprehensione Dei, ut primi principii et ultimi finis, atque adeo summi boni. De SS. Beat. l. 1. c. 12. [vol. 2. p. 401. col. 1. Prag. 1721.]*

should seem there were then a sort of judaizing Christians, who supposing the law to be given by angels, would have introduced the worship of them into the Church, and their pretence was plausible, humility and modesty.

They taught that the great Lord of the universe was as little to be seen and approached unto, as to be comprehended; and therefore that no man ought to dare to address to him immediately, but by the interposition of angels, bringing first their prayers to them, in order to their being offered up to God. This the Synod of Laodicea plainly forbids, calling it an hidden idolatry, and a forsaking the Lord Jesus Christ,* and approaching to idolatry. Theodoret, upon the text, calls it † a vice that had continued a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia; and that even in his time there were oratories to be seen among them, to St. Michael the archangel.

It follows, intruding into those things that he hath not seen; that is, taking the liberty to talk of things that God had not revealed, and therefore speaking at random and by guess of those matters; as indeed the Schoolmen do; as will appear to any person that looks into their divinity about the number, orders, names, and ministry of holy angels.

“Not holding the Head;” that is, they who make use of the mediation of angels, forsake our Lord Jesus Christ, whom God hath constituted the Head of his Church, and made the only Mediator between God and man.‡

To put by the force of this text, no fewer than three Cardinals have spent their wit and ammunition upon it.

Cardinal Perron would have this worship of angels, not to be understood of the worship paid to angels, but the worship delivered by them, and consequently, that the Jewish religion or way of worship, was the only thing forbidden in this text; concerning which, we read, Heb. ii. 2, “That it was spoken by angels.” And Gal. iii. 19, “Was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” But this witty device has been sufficiently exposed by M. Daillé,§ shewing, in many instances, that the genitive that follows *Θρησκεία*, worship, is always taken *objectivé*, for the object, and not *originaliter*, for the author or institutor of worship: thus “the worship of idols,”

* *Κεκρυμμένη ειδωλολατρεία ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ ειδωλολατρείαν προσῆλθεν.* Canon. 36. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 1503. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† *Τὸ πάθος.* [vol. 3. p. 490. Hal. 1771.] § 1 Tim. ii. 5.

§ *De object. cult. Rel. Lat. 1. 3. p. 31.* [Genev. 1664.]

Wisd. xiv. 27, is not the worship prescribed by idols, but the worship payed them. "His religion is vain," in the 1st of James 26, and, "our religion," in Acts xxvi. 5, is not the religion they were the authors of, but the religion they professed and practised. He adds, that Petavius rejects this exposition of Perron's for this reason, that if this had been St. Paul's meaning, he would, according to his usual phrase in his other Epistles, have called it, not the worship,* but the law of angels, the law delivered by angels.

Bellarmino will have the place to be levelled only against certain heretics, the Simonians and others, who held that the angels were a sort of inferior gods, and that the world was made by them; and consequently, that it does not forbid all worship of angels. But can any thing be expressed in more general terms, than this caution of the Apostle's? And though, it may be, there were some heretics in those days, that held opinions concerning the nature, and office, and worship of angels, that the Church of Rome does not, and also far worse than any hold and practise in that Church; yet it does not follow, that because they were most guilty, she is not guilty at all: that because the Apostle forbids the worship of angels as gods, and makers of the world, he does not forbid it to them as creatures of the highest rank and order.

But Baronius being sensible how home St. Paul and the canon speak to this point, begs Theodoret's pardon, and tells him that he understood neither the one nor the other: and that St. Paul here forbade only† the worship of false and heathenish gods; and that those oratories dedicated to St. Michael were set up by Catholics, and not heretics, it being then the practice of the Church to invoke angels.

Here, (1.) We may observe how these two great Cardinals contradict one another: a sign they were at a loss what to say. § Baronius asserting, that "there is no footsteps left of such heretics in that age; and that those oratories were erected by Catholics."|| Bellarmine, "That there were such, Simon and his disciples, mentioned by several of the Fathers, Irenæus,

* Not *Θρησκείαν*, but *Νόμον*. † Fuisse Hæreticos, Simonianos, qui quosdam Angelos quasi minores Deos, et qui mundum fabricassent, adorarent. De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 20. [vol. 2. p. 417. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

‡ Haud feliciter assecutus est verborum Pauli sensum, &c. Incautimimis, quæ a Catholicis essent ante instituta, Hæreticis, quorum nulla esset memoria, tribuens. Tom. 1. An. 60. sect. 20. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 570. col. 1.] § Eod. loc. || Eod. loc.

Tertullian, and others, and that their oratories were built by heretics."

(2.) Though we might venture to stake Theodoret's judgment and credit against Baronius's, who lived nearer the Apostolical age, and consequently understood the truth in this particular more perfectly, yet we need not his authority to explain the text. The very argument the Apostle uses to dissuade them from the worship of angels, shewing that those then guilty of it, were not heathens, nor the angels they worshipped heathen dæmons, or inferior deities; but Christians, though perhaps such as were too much addicted to the law of Moses; and good angels, such as were owned both by Jews and Christians. For had the text been designed against the former, *viz.* heathen worshippers of heathen gods, it had been very impertinent for the Apostle to have urged, that by that practice "they forsook the Lord Christ, and held not the Head;" when as they never had believed on him.

Acts x. 25, 26, Cornelius falling down at St. Peter's feet, and worshipping, is thus reproved for it by the Apostle, "Stand up, I myself also am a man:" as if he had said, God only, and none but he, is religiously to be worshipped.

We read, Acts xiv. from ver. 11 to 16, with what indignation and abhorrence St. Paul and Barnabas forbade the Lycaonians to offer sacrifices to them, though they had given clear demonstrations of a Divine spirit within them, by the miraculous cure of a cripple that had never walked, assigning the same reason in effect for it, as St. Peter did to Cornelius: "We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God;" that is, that you should abstain from worshipping after a religious manner, any created beings, though never so excellent, whether in heaven or earth, but the living God only, the Creator of all things, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things therein.

Lastly, What God and our Saviour forbade, St. Paul cautioned against, and holy men refused, we find an angel himself rejecting, Rev. xix. 10: "And I," says St. John, "fell at his feet to worship; and he said unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God." Repeated again, Rev. xxii. 8, 9, "See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book; worship God."

Here several things are worthy our observation. (1.) That the thing is twice forbid, and St. John twice reprov'd for it. (2.) That the angel forbade it with some vehemency and earnestness of spirit; which shews the thing to be very evil and highly displeasing to God; he seems as it were somewhat disturbed at the sight of it; and that he might do what he could to prevent the action, he spake with haste, and abruptly, *ὄρα μὴ*, "See thou do it not." (3.) He adds two reasons against it: the first taken from the equality of our state and condition, being all creatures and fellow-servants, "I am thy fellow-servant:" the other from the dishonour and affront it does to God, invading his property, and robbing him of that honour that is his peculiar; so much those words imply, "worship God:" for was not religious adoration a part of the incommunicable worship of God, those words could have been no argument against St. John's adoring the angel; but he might have adored the angel and God too.

But here they reply many things:

1. They tell us, that St. John took this angel to be the Son of God, the same that appeared to him at the beginning, chap. i. saying, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: I am he that was dead and am alive, and behold I live for evermore, and have the keys of hell and death."

I answer; it is possible St. John might think so at the first time of the angel's appearing to him; but it is not to be imagined, that at his second appearance, after that he had been told that he was his fellow-servant, and chid for worshipping him, he should fall into the same mistake again. Is it not much more probable, that he did it in a kind of extasy, being astonished at the dazzling lustre and brightness of his appearance? But be it so, that St. John took the angel to be the Son of God: this is so far from serving their cause, that it turns with great force against them; for if St. John was reprov'd for worshipping an angel, when he thought it was God in the shape of an angel, are not Papists much more blameable for worshipping angels as such, when they think them to be but angels?

2. They say, that the angel modestly refused to be worshipped, in honour to Christ, who had assumed human nature; not but that it was the angels' due, and might still be paid them as it was before Christ's incarnation; but in complaisance to it, they are willing to indulge the race of mankind that omission, and to deny themselves, to do honour to Christ; so

that "both the angels do well to refuse it, and mankind do well to pay it."

But what is this, but to say that the angels pass a compliment on the Son of God, as if he was beholden to them that do not share with him in the worship of men? What is this but to conceive most unworthily of those blessed spirits, as if they could be guilty of that hypocrisy and dissimulation too often practised in human conversation? As if they could condescend to the foppishness and courtship of this lower world, wherein men oft-times strive to excel each other in their civilities, and sometimes outwardly refuse those respects which in their hearts they most desire, and are ambitious after.

3. They say, that though the angel refused to be worshipped by St. John, as he would have done also by the other Apostles, who were engaged in the same work with him, in bearing testimony to Jesus; yet was it due to them from other Christians of a lower rank and order.

But this is answered in the reason the angel gave for his refusing to be worshipped, which reaches to all sorts of Christians, to one as well as another, he being a fellow-servant with the meanest that believe in Christ, as well as with an Apostle or Prophet; and so it follows, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of them that keep the sayings of this book."

4. That which follows is very surprising; but what will not great wits venture at? Cardinal Bellarmine will not only have these words no argument against the worship of angels, but an argument for it: "If St. John," says he, "thought him to be an angel, and yet worshipped him, why are we reproached for doing what St. John did? Do the Calvinists know better than St. John did, whether angels are to be worshipped?"

I answer, if St. John thought him to be an angel, and yet worshipped him, why should we not be reprov'd for doing what St. John did, if St. John did what he should not have done? "Do the Calvinists know better than St. John whether angels are to be worshipped?" I answer, do the Papists know better than the angels, whether angels are to be worshipped, who expressly forbade it? "See thou do it not; worship God."

* Si Johannes putavit esse Angelum, et tamen adoravit; cur nos reprehendimur qui facimus quod Johannes fecit? Num melius Johanne norunt Calvinistæ sintne Angeli adorandi? De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 14. [ut supra, p. 406. col. 2.]

V.

No proof from Scripture for the solemn Invocation of Angels and Saints departed.

Of this there are three branches: 1. Praying to them to bestow or to pray for blessings for us. 2. Praying to be heard for their sakes, in favour of them and their merits. 3. Praying to them as intercessors and mediators for us in the presence of God. For none of which is there any proof in Scripture.

The first branch is: There is no proof in Scripture for praying to them to bestow, or to pray to God for blessings for us.

Many of their learned men freely grant,* that there is no express command, either in the Old or New Testament, for the invocation of saints departed.

Not in the Old Testament, because the souls of the patriarchs, and other holy men, were detained in limbo, and were not admitted into heaven, and the beatific vision, till our Saviour, after his resurrection, carried them up thither. But was it so: if the saints come to know the prayers of their supplicants by revelation from God, as some of them affirm, why might they not have come to the knowledge of them in limbo, as well as in heaven, since God could have made them known to them in one place as well as another? Besides, were not Enoch and Elias carried up immediately into heaven? and the latter in the very sight of Elisha. Were not Noah and his sons the direct posterity of Enoch? Were they not in great distress in the time of the flood? Was there not a great zeal of affection between Elias and Elisha? And yet, notwithstanding all these great inducements and encouragements to it, taken from the endearing relation of a father to his sons, and them in distress, and of a master to his disciples; yet we no more read of "Holy Enoch, or holy Elias pray for us," than of "Holy Abraham or holy Isaac pray for us."

Not in the New Testament, lest it should be an occasion of offence and scandal to the new converted Gentiles, and make them think that they had only changed their gods, but not their religion; that the Christian doctrine was only a device of

* Bell. de SS. Beat. c. 19. [Ibid. p. 412.] Salm. in 1 Tim. ii. disp. 7. [ut supra, vol. 15. p. 473. col. 1.] Eck. Enchir. de Ven. Sanct. c. 15.

the Apostle to thrust out their own demons and heroes, and to put in themselves.

And is not this a good argument still? Is it not of as much force now to cast this practice out of the Church, as it was then to keep it out? Does it not give infinite offence to a great part of the Christian world? And is it not esteemed, and that justly by them, to be the old Pagan worship revived, or something very near it? For it is not the change of the object that makes any material difference, or that can excuse it, whilst the act or kind of worship is the same: religious worship is God's peculiar, and to give it to a creature was the Pagan worship and superstition.

Now is it not a very unaccountable thing, that the Church of Rome should make that an article of faith, for which there is confessedly no foundation in Scripture? And is it not as much to be wondered at, that if this practice was to obtain in the Church, the Scriptures that give so many plain directions concerning prayer, the object, the manner of performance, the qualifications of the suppliant, should be wholly silent about this? That the Apostles, who were guided by the Spirit of God into all truth, and therefore cannot be supposed to omit any part of the Christian doctrine that was necessary, nay, profitable for the salvation of souls, should quite forget it, and neither practise it themselves to the blessed Virgin, who died before some of them, nor in any of their writings instruct the people in the piety and usefulness of it?

But though there are no plain texts in the Old Testament for invocation of saints, there are for invocation of angels, and they insist chiefly on these.

In Gen. xlviii. 16, it is said that Jacob prayed to an angel to bless the two sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim; and "the angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads."

To this I answer, first, that this might be only a wish, and not a solemn prayer; and if a prayer, not put up to the angel, but to God, that he would appoint the same angel that preserved him to bless them; a form of prayer like that of David's, Psalm xxxv. 6, "Let the angel of the Lord persecute them;" he prayed to God that it might be, not to the angel to do it. The like is to be said to Tobit, chap. v. 15, "God, who dwelleth in heaven, prosper your journey, and the angel of God keep you company." Which words are not spoken to the angel, but concerning him, merely by way of wish and desire, and not by way of supplication. But if they are a

prayer, then again it must be to God, as before, to send and appoint his angel.

Secondly, This angel is generally thought, by the Fathers (whom the Romanists, in interpreting Scripture, are sworn to follow), to be the Son of God ; so Justin Martyr,* disputing with Trypho the Jew : “ He, an angel, God and Lord, appeared unto Abraham in human shape, and was seen of Jacob in the form and figure of a man.”† So Athanasius,‡ and St. Cyril of Alexandria expound them, and thus they argue : “ How indecent was it for Jacob to join God and a creature together !” as he must do if the angel was no more than an angel, “ The Lord that fed me all my days, the angel which redeemed me.” This can seem reasonable to none but the Romanists, who commonly practise it, joining in their doxology the “ blessed Virgin with God the Father and our blessed Saviour.” Again, “ How more unworthy of so holy a man as Jacob to pass by God, as it were, and to make his intercession to an angel, as if he had more confidence in the angel than in God ?” §

Lastly, Who was the angel that had redeemed Jacob from all evil ? Was it not he that had wrestled with him ? Gen. xxxii. 28, that had delivered him from his brother Esau ? Whom he would not let go till he had blessed him ? And does not Jacob say of him, ver. 30, “ I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved ?” For the confirmation of this exposition, it will not be amiss to consult Hosea xii. 3, 4, 5 : “ He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God ; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed : he wept and made supplication unto him : he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us ; even the Lord God of hosts, the Lord is his memorial.” Where the person that is called “ an angel,” ver. 4. is in ver. 3, called “ God,” not because he represented God, but was God himself ; the word *Elohim*, in the plural number, being never used (as some learned men have observed) to denote one angel, but many, but often used to signify God. And ver. 5, he is called “ Jehovah, God of hosts ;” appella-

* Οὗτος καὶ Ἄγγελος, καὶ Θεός, καὶ Κύριος, ἐν ἰδίᾳ Ἀνθρώπου τῷ Ἰακώβ φανείς. p. 71. [p. 156. Par. 1742.]

† Sermon. 4.—contra Arian. [vol. 1. p. 260, 261. Heidelb. 1601.] Thesaur. lib. 3. cap. 6.

‡ Laus Deo, Virginique matri, Deo item Jesu Christo. Bell. in fin. tom. 1.

§ Perer. in fin. lib. de motus et mundi ætern. Greg. Val. in fin. omn. Op.

tions proper to God alone, and not communicable to any created angel : for thus saith God of that name Jehovah, or "I am that I am," Exod. iii. 15, "This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

To this, some of them add those other words of Jacob,* in the latter part of the 16th verse, "And let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;" but most ignorantly and impertinently : for who does not see the difference betwixt calling on the name of Jacob, and the name of Jacob being called upon them? Nothing can be more evident, than that Jacob did not speak of a religious invocation of himself after he was dead, and of his ancestors, Abraham and Isaac, but of the adopting of the sons of Joseph into his family, and dividing to them a portion with the rest of his children, in the land of Canaan ; and that though they were born in Egypt, out of his family, they should no less be esteemed his sons. It is a known phrase among the Jews, whereby is expressed the engrafting of any person, man or woman, into a family, explained beyond all contradiction in Gen. xlviii. 5, "And now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, which were born unto thee in the land of Egypt, before I came unto thee in Egypt, are mine ; as Reuben and Simeon they shall be mine." As also in Isa. iv. 1, "In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, &c. Only let thy name be called upon us ;" so the margin reads it verbatim from the Hebrew ; that is, as it is in the text, "Only let us be called by thy name," or accounted thine. The same phrase we find, Dan. ix. 18, "O my God, behold the city, whereupon thy name is called ;" so in the Hebrew, but rendered in the text, "which is called by thy name." Was it needful in so plain a case, I might produce their own interpreters† against themselves ; but I shall set down only the words of one of them, "The name of one man, according to the usual speech of the Jews, is said to be called upon another, when that other is called by his name."‡

With the like confidence and impertinence do Bellarmine and others cite Job v. 1, "Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and to which of the saints wilt thou turn?" Bellarmine here tells us, that by saints, according to St. Austin,

* Bell. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 20.

† Ribera in Comment. Am. c. 8. ver. 12.

‡ Nicol. Lyran. in locum. Fonseca in Cajet.

are meant angels, and cites many other places of Job where angels are called saints.

Be this granted, is there here any precept to pray to them ? No, he confesses, the words are no farther an argument for it, than as they shew it “was the custom of that age to implore the aid and protection of angels.”*

But how do they shew this ? if the words have a quite different sense and design, as appears they have from the context. We find that Eliphaz, in the former chapter, instead of pitying Job, and administering comfort to him in his agony, accused him of impiety towards God, and unrighteousness towards men ;† alleging for it, that God never afflicts men in so grievous a manner, but for some great and notable wickedness ; and for the proof of this, he appeals to Job's‡ and his own experience, to the admonitions he had frequently given others of it, to the many instances of it in the destruction of great oppressors ;§ and tells him at last, that he was confirmed in this truth by an angel, who in the night had appeared to him :|| and lest all this was not enough, he reassumes the argument in this verse, and bids him ask the opinion, and consult the experience of other holy men or saints, and he would find that all of them would seal to this truth ; nay, but that he was so unworthy, and could not expect it, if an angel should appear to him, as one had done to him, he also would bear witness to it.

A like text to this, and as little to their purpose, is that in Job xix. 21, “Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me.”

By *friends* cannot, without manifest violence to the context, be meant *angels* ; but Job's three friends that came to visit him, and instead of applying fit lenitives to his anguish, did, by their sharp and cutting reproaches, wound him deeper, and enrage his sores. Thus he begins the chapter, and complains of their cruelty, ver. 1, 2, “How long will ye vex my soul, and break me in pieces with words ? These ten times have ye reproached me,” &c. And having in the following verses very lively expressed his bitter and pungent afflictions, in ver. 21, he takes up the complaint again, “Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends.” *Ye*, the same persons he complained of before ; as if he had said, O ye my friends, who pro-

* C. 19. [ut supra, p. 412. col. 1.]
§ Ver. 9, 10.

† Job iv. 7. ‡ Ver. 8.
|| Ver. 11, to the end.

fessed to come to comfort me, do not ye make my condition more deplorable; let it suffice that the hand of the Lord lies heavy upon me, do you not, by your cruel taunts, unreasonable and inhuman censures, add to my load and pressures; but after others have forsaken me in my miseries, shew yourselves to be friends indeed, by the comforts and assistances you administer to me.

Their chief proof for invocation of saints, and what they most insist on, is yet behind; it is some such texts of Scripture, wherein good men on earth are commanded to pray for one another, and from examples of that kind. A number of these are to be found both in the Old and New Testament; 1 Sam. vii. 8, "And the children of Israel said to Samuel, Cease not to cry unto the Lord our God for us, that he will save us out of the hands of the Philistines." Job xlii. 8, "And my servant Job he shall pray for you, for him will I accept." Rom. xv. 30, "I beseech you, brethren, that you strive together in your prayers to God for me." To the same purpose are cited, Eph. vi. 18, 19, "Pray always with all prayer and supplication for all saints, and for me." 1 Thess. v. 25, "Brethren, pray for us." 2 Thess. iii. 1, "Finally, brethren, pray for us." Col. iv. 3. Heb. viii. 8, "Praying also for us." Eph. iii. 14, 16, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant you to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man."

It is confessed on all hands, and these texts abundantly prove it, that it is the indispensable duty of the members of Christ's church, to pray for one another; and that they may and ought to desire one another's prayers. God has for great and wise reasons commanded and encouraged this; hereby we testify our mutual love to one another, express our sympathy and fellow-feeling with one another's miseries; most effectually preserve the unity of the body of Christ, and uphold the solemn public worship of God in the world; which consists of meeting together, and putting up to one common Father mutual prayers for one another's prosperity. This also gives great credit and reputation to religion and virtue, when God hears the prayers of good men; and upon their supplications diverts a judgment, or removes a calamity from themselves and others. But from hence can be drawn no argument for the invocation of saints and angels:

For, 1. Christians on earth are by these texts empowered only to desire others to pray for them. But the Church of

Rome prays to saints and angels, not only to pray for them, but to bestow blessings upon them, to give this or that temporal or spiritual good to them, and to help them in this or that particular difficulty or distemper; which is to suppose them to have a most certain power to help them, and to terminate the worship on them. Innumerable instances of this kind may be produced; and the matter of fact is too notorious to be denied. Bonaventure, a cardinal and a saint, has burlesqued the Book of Psalms,* applying whatever is said in them to God the Father, and his Son Christ Jesus, unto the Virgin Mother. And was it true, as they of late do palliate the business, that in whatever words or phrases their prayers to saints are expressed, the meaning of the Church in them all is but an *ora pro nobis*; yet this would not fetch it off, since it is not so much the matter of the prayer as the nature of the prayer that makes it unlawful to be prayed to them. For,

2. When we are in those texts obliged to desire our fellow Christians to pray for us, that desire is not a praying to them, but a friendly request; but the Church of Rome enjoins to call upon the saints departed, in a most devout manner,† after the manner of supplicants; and we know that it is their constant practice to do it, with all the circumstances of religious worship, in consecrated places, at holy altars, at the same time they worship God with bended knees, with eyes and hands lift up; witness the rosaries, the psalters, the hours, and all other offices of devotion, wherewith they worship the blessed Virgin; witness the oratories and chapels they have erected for her honour and service. Now does it follow, that because I am commanded to desire the prayers of my brethren on earth, I am also commanded after a most religious manner, to invoke the saints in heaven to pray for me?

3. These texts require us to desire our fellow Christians to be only mere supplicants and petitioners for us, to pray for us as they do for themselves. But the Church of Rome teaches and practises more in their invocation of saints, *viz.* to pray to them to become their advocates and mediators in heaven with God. Now these are two different things, and the one not to be inferred from the other. For in the first, in desiring the prayers of good men on earth, we rely on the goodness of God, and the truth of his promise to hear and answer them. In the latter, praying to saints in heaven as advocates and

* Tom. 6. 478. [ut supra, p. 502, &c.]

† Suppliciter invocare. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. Lut. Par.]

mediators, we rely on their merits, the favour and interest they have in God ; as if they were more easily prevailed with by our prayers than our God and Saviour ; as if they had greater power in the court of heaven than the Son of God ; or that God would do more for men at their importunity than from his own infinite love and propensity to do good.

4. These texts require us to desire the prayers of good men on earth, who hear us, and know our condition ; but the Church of Rome requires men to pray to saints in heaven, who cannot hear us, and for ought we know, are ignorant of our state. Now does it follow, that because I may desire the prayers of one that is present, I may invoke the prayers of one that is absent ? Nothing can be said against the former ; but to do the latter, it is either an absurd and foolish, or a sinful and idolatrous action. Foolish, if they believe the saints in heaven do not hear them ; idolatrous, if they do : for that is to suppose them to be omnipresent, and to ascribe to them one of those perfections that is incommunicably inherent in the nature of God. The truth of which I thus prove. He that prays to a saint departed prays to him in faith, in a belief that he hears and can help him. This faith is founded on something, either that the saint can hear and help him by his own natural power, or by some other means. If by the former, then the point is granted, and that ascribes to him an omnipresence, that is above the condition of a creature ; if by the latter, some revelation must be produced from God to that purpose. For it is not enough that God can make known our prayers to the saints one way or other ; but if they pray in faith to them, some proof must be produced that God does do it ; for guess and conjecture is not a sufficient foundation for faith ; it must have for its bottom either a natural power in the saint, or a revelation from God of some other way. But there is no such revelation as to the latter, and therefore the praying in faith to them, necessarily implies the former, and consequently ascribes to them that omnipresence that is inseparable from the Deity. The Church of Rome tells us of many ways (all which I considered before under the second head), but they are not agreed which to fix upon ; a true sign they are uncertain of all ; and though God may and can do it any of those ways, that is no proof that he does do it by any of them, unless he had told us so.

5. When we desire our fellow-Christians to pray for us, that is a vocal desire ; but the Church of Rome allows of mental as well as vocal prayers to be made to the saints

departed, which makes them omniscient, and ascribes to them the knowledge of the heart, and all its most secret motions.*

I shall now produce the several texts of Scripture that make God the only object of prayer, as well as of the other parts of religious worship; but to name them all, would be to transcribe a considerable part both of the Old and New Testament. This every Protestant knows that has been conversant in the Bible, and every Papist would be convinced of that had a licence and will to read it. It shall suffice therefore to set down a few.

No man will deny, but that the tabernacle and temple at Jerusalem were peculiarly consecrated to the honour and worship of the one God Jehovah, maker of heaven and earth. Now here were the Jews appointed to bring and perform all their worship; here they performed their vows, kept their solemn festivals; hither they brought their tithes and offerings, and first-fruits; here their sacrifices were to be offered, Deut. xii. 13, 14, here also their prayers were to be put up. And when it so happened that they could not repair to the temple, being in exile or in war, they were to pray towards the temple. Thus Solomon prayed God to hear the petitions that were put up towards the temple, 1 Kings viii. 30. And Daniel in Babylon, Dan. vi. 10, prayed with his windows open towards Jerusalem. Thus was God the only object of prayer in the Jewish religion.

He is so also in the Christian, Phil. iv. 6, "In everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." And in James i. 5, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask it of God, who gives to all men liberally." "How shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed?" says St. Paul, Rom. x. 14. Which words directly exclude all from being the objects of prayer, that are not the objects of our faith; and consequently, if we believe only in God, we must call upon him only.

Our blessed Saviour has thus taught us to pray, Luke xi. 2, "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, &c. for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory." Or Matth. vi. 9, "After this manner pray ye, Our Father, &c. For thine is the kingdom," &c.

Whether this prayer was prescribed by our Saviour as a form to be used, or a pattern to be imitated by us, it is all

* Voce vel mente supplicare. Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. Lut. Par. 1672.] Bell. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 20. [ut supra, p. 419. col. 1.]

one ; it still directs and obliges us to put up our prayers to our heavenly Father, whose is the kingdom, the power, and the glory. We may observe also that every petition in this prayer is directed to God ; “ Our Father which art in heaven,” being understood, though not repeated, in every one of them ; and if, as some tell us, this prayer contains a summary of whatever ought to be the subject-matter of a Christian’s prayer ; then whatever I ought to pray for, I ought to pray to God for it.

Bellarmino tells us,* that this argument will not hold, because it excludes the second and third Persons in the blessed Trinity from being the object of prayer, as much as it does saints and angels.

I answer : the word Father† in this prayer is to be taken essentially, and not personally, and so excludes not the other two Persons of the most holy and undivided Trinity, but only those that are of a different nature from them ; now, if the whole three Persons are one in essence, then whenever we pray to, and do honour to God the Father, we must at the same time worship the other two, though not so directly, who are one with him.

I shall set down but one place more, Matth. xxi. 13, “ It is written,” says our Lord, “ my house shall be called the house of prayer ;” so essential a part, you see, of God’s worship, is prayer, that God thought fit to describe his own house by that name ; but if prayer did appertain to any other beside God, the house of prayer would not have been a sure distinguishing sign of God’s house.

The second branch is : That there is no proof from Scripture, that we may pray to God to be heard for the sake of the saints, in favour of them and their merits.

The texts they make use of defend this, are many, but not different in their sense and meaning, and therefore one answer will serve them all : they are such as these :

Exod. xxxii. 13 : Moses thus prayed in behalf of the Israelites, when they had highly provoked God by worshipping the golden calf, “ Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants.”

So Solomon prayed in the behalf of himself, 2 Chron. vi. 16 : “ Now therefore, O Lord God of Israel, keep with thy servant David my father, that which thou hast promised.”

* C. 20.

† See Discourse of Invocation of Saints.

In 1 Kings xv. 4, it is said, "For David's sake did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem," when he suffered wicked Abijam to succeed in the throne of Judah.

In 2 Kings xix. 24, God promises for his servant David's sake to defend the city of Jerusalem against Sennacherib's mighty host, in the reign of Hezekiah.

Again, Psalm cxxxii. 1, 10: "Lord, remember David, and all his afflictions; for thy servant David's sake, turn not away the face of thine anointed." And in the Song of the Three Children, that is added to the Apocrypha, ver. 12, they are said thus to pray, "Cause not thy mercy to depart from us, for thy beloved Abraham's sake, for thy servant Isaac's sake, and for thy holy Israel's sake."

Now for the right understanding of all these texts, we are to consider, that these holy men, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David, God was pleased, as a reward to their faithfulness and uprightness, and for the encouragement of religion and virtue in the world, of his mere grace and goodness to enter into a covenant with them, and many times to repeat and ratify it, "that he would be their God, and the God of their seed;" that he would take them under his especial care and patronage, and bestow many blessings and deliverances upon them. Hereupon, in after ages, their posterity were wont in their prayers to mention their great and worthy ancestors; not that they begged to be heard and answered "for their sakes and merits," but that they might (as it were) remember God of his covenant and promise made to their forefathers, and so begged to be heard "for his own sake, his name sake, and his mercy sake." So indeed those places expound themselves, those holy men being seldom or never mentioned in prayer, but God's "promise and covenant" is also added.

In the fore-quoted place, Exod. xxxii. 13, it follows, "To whom thou hast sworn by thyself, and saidst, I will multiply your seed as the stars in heaven."

In the Song of the Three Children, ver. 13, it is added, "To whom thou hast spoken and promised, that thou wilt multiply their seed as the stars."

And where God promised "for David's sake to defend Jerusalem, to turn away his anger;" the meaning is, for his covenant's sake, and for his promise sake, which he made with and to David.

So God himself teaches us to expound these texts. Exod. vi. 3, 4, 5: "And I appeared unto Abraham, &c. And I

have also established my covenant with them, &c. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, and I have remembered my covenant." Lev. xxvi. 41, 42: "If then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, &c. then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember."

And as good men were wont to adjure God by his truth and faithfulness engaged in covenant with their forefathers to spare them and to save them, so also was God pleased, the stronger to confirm their faith in his covenant and promises, sometimes to repeat and confirm it afresh to them. Psalm lxxxix. 28, "My covenant shall stand fast with them." Ver. 33, "My loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Ver. 34, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips; once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David."

The doctrine of merit is a stranger to the Scriptures, and what no creature, though innocent, is capable of; the highest degree of virtue and goodness being our duty, no man can merit at God's hand, for that is to do more than his duty; and if the innocent cannot merit, much less the wicked and unclean; and who can say, I have no sin? All the promises therefore made by God to good men and their posterity, are not to be reckoned as a debt to their deserts, but as the effect of his grace and mercy in Christ Jesus; having deserved no good thing from God, nay, having demerited highly against him, we can expect nothing from God, but by way of grace and covenant; and the justice and wisdom of God requiring that this covenant should be founded in our Saviour's blood, and sealed and ratified in it, we have nothing else but Christ and his merits to rely upon, nothing else to plead in the behalf of ourselves and others at the throne of God; but this we have, and this is sufficient.

This was long ago prefigured by the Jews being obliged to offer up all their prayers to God at the temple, the temple being a type of Christ's incarnation. As God dwelt in the temple then, so he does now in our nature; and what the temple was to the Jews, that is Christ Jesus to us, the way and means that procures the acceptance of our prayers with God.

To this may be added many places in the New Testament: "He is able to save to the uttermost all those that come unto God by him, for he ever lives to make intercession for us," Heb.

vii. 25. To this our Saviour hath appropriated his own granting what his disciples should ask of God: John xiv. 13, 14, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that I will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." To this he elsewhere appropriates God's granting what they should ask of him: John xv. 16, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." To this he expressly obliges his disciples, John xvi. 24, "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." Now to pray in the name of Christ, is to pray through his mediation, upon the encouragement of his merits, and his being our intercessor and advocate at God's right hand in our nature; who having perfectly fulfilled his Father's will, and by his death made an atonement for our sins, and purchased grace and glory, and all good things for us, hath given thereby the greatest assurance, that whenever we go duly qualified in his name, we shall get access, and both our persons and services be accepted. And that this is to ask in Christ's name appears from John i. 12, "To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name;" that is, on the account of his merits and undertaking. So John xx. 31, "These things are written that ye might believe, and that believing, ye might have life through his name;" that is, through his merits and mediation.

The third branch is: There is no proof from Scripture for praying to saints and angels, as intercessors and mediators in the presence of God.

The Romanists positively assert, that the saints are our "advocates and mediators in heaven," and pray to them as such; and though they distinguish betwixt a "mediator of redemption," and a "mediator of intercession," ascribing the first solely to Christ, and making the latter common betwixt him and saints in heaven; yet, whoever considers their doctrine of merit and supererogation, and that of indulgences founded upon it; whoever observes how often they desire in their devotions to be heard and assisted for the merits, as well as prayers of this or that other saint, and that Bellarmine* himself confesses, that they may, after a sort, be called "our

* *Precibus et Meritis*—Non absurdum est si sancti viri Redemptores nostri aliquo modo dicuntur. *De Indul.* l. 1. c. 4. [vol. 3. p. 657. col. 1. Prag. 1721.]

Redeemers," will be apt to conclude that they attribute both to the saints as well as to Christ.

But admitting the distinction, there is as little proof for the one as for the other in Scripture ; the texts they appeal to for the justification of it, being very much mistaken by them.

The first is Gal. iii. 19, where the Apostle, speaking of the law, says, "it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." From whence they argue, that the saints in heaven may in the same sense be called mediators, wherein St. Paul calls Moses a mediator.

I shall not answer with some learned men, that by mediator here may not be meant Moses, but Christ, the promised Messiah, who spake with Moses on the mount,* and delivered the law to him, being attended on by an innumerable company of angels,† for the greater glory and majesty of their Lord.

But granting it to be Moses ; he is called a mediator in a far different sense from that wherein that appellation is given to the saints above, viz. as he was an *internuncio*, a person that went betwixt God and the people, relating the covenants and agreements made betwixt them. "I stood betwixt the Lord and you at that time," says Moses of himself, Deut. v. 5. For what ? It follows, "to shew you the word of the Lord." And as Moses brought the word and law of God to the people, Exod. xix. 7, so he returned the words of the people to the Lord, ver. 8. "And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him : and all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do : and Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord."

To this Bellarmine‡ agrees, where he says, "all such messengers may in a sense be called mediators." But does it follow, because Moses was employed as a messenger betwixt God and the Jews, at the delivery of the law, that the saints above are our advocates and mediators with God in the court of heaven.

They cite also, Rev. viii. 3, where an angel is said to offer the prayers of the saints to God. The words are these : "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer ; and there was given unto him much incense,

* Deut. xxxiii. 2. Acts vii. 53.

† Angelis dispositis.

‡ Quatenus nuncii utrinque itantes, pacta ac foedera utriusque partis referunt, quomodo omnes internuncii dici possunt mediatores. De Christo, l. 5. c. 1. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 261. col. 1.]

that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which was before the throne.

To this I need say no more, but that the generality of learned men, as well of the Church of Rome as the Reformed, understand by the Angel here, our blessed Saviour, whose office alone it is to offer up the prayers of the saints, and for whose sake alone they are accepted. So Thomas Aquinas:* “The angel, to wit, Christ, who is called an angel, because sent by the Father into the world” So the Jesuit Viegas:† “All interpreters do confess, that by angel is here meant our Lord Christ, because of no other can it be said, that he offers up to the Father after so glorious and majestic a manner, the incense, that is, the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar.” To confirm this sense of the words, we may observe that he is called in the text, “another angel;” intimating, that he was one, both in nature and office, different from the others mentioned in the verse before, ver. 2: “I saw the seven angels which stood before God;” and then, ver. 3, “another angel came and stood at the altar.”

The next is Rev. v. 8, where it is said, “that the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.” By the prayers of the saints they mean of those saints that are living upon the earth, and by the four beasts and four and twenty elders, the saints that are in heaven; and from thence conclude, that the saints in heaven do offer up the prayers of the saints on earth.

But if by the four beasts and four and twenty elders are not meant the members of the Church triumphant, but the bishops and pastors of the Church militant, whose office it is to present the prayers and praises of the Church to God, then is this text cited by them to no purpose. And that they are thus*to be understood, may not only be collected from the very testimonies Bellarmine† cites against it; but some of the Fathers are very plain and positive in it; but instead of setting down their words, I shall desire the reader to peruse the text, with the following verses to the end of the chapter, and he will easily perceive that they are a representation of the whole

* Angelus, scilicet Christus, qui dicitur Angelus, quia missus a Patre in mundum, &c. In cap. 8. Apoc.

† Reliqui omnes interpretes esse Christum Dominum confitentur, quia nulli alii quam Christo, &c. In cap. 8. Apoc. sect. 2.

‡ Ambr. in loc. Iren. l. 4. c. 33. [ut supra, p. 249.]

Church of Christ both in heaven and earth, joining together in their doxologies and praises to God for the victories of the Lamb, and the redemption of the world by his blood, ver. 8. to 14: "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, &c. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, &c. And I beheld and heard the voices of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing: and every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honour, glory and power be unto him that sits on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

I might pass over what they produce out of Tobit xii. 12, 15, where the angel Raphael is said "to bring the remembrance of their prayers before the Holy One, and to present the prayers of the saints."

The book being apocryphal, and so not of sufficient authority, we have no more reason to give credit to it in this place, than in others that are apparently false; as chap. v. 12, where it brings in the angel saying what was not true, *viz.* "I am Azarias the son of Ananias the great, and of thy brethren."

There is but one text more, and I believe the reader will excuse me, if I do but name it, without making any reflections upon it, Gen. ii. 18: "It is not good that the man should be alone, I will make an help meet for him;" that is, says Henno,* "One Advocate or Mediator in heaven is not sufficient for mankind, which has so many causes of the highest and most dangerous consequence depending before God; let us make him a meet help, *i. e.* the blessed Virgin."

I must not stay here to shew, that the angels and saints above are no way qualified for the office of a Mediator, unless it could be proved that they knew our desires, and were thoroughly acquainted with our case and condition, and haad a sufficient power to undertake our patronage, and a sufficient merit and

* Non sufficit unus Advocatus vel Mediator humano generi in cœlo, cum tot ac tam periculosa causas habeant coram Deo, faciamus ei adiutorium, hoc est, beatam Virginem. Wicel. Elenc. abus. p. 125. [Fascic. Rer. Expet. et Fug. vol. 2. p. 747. Lond. 1690.]

interest in God to procure it from him. But my business is to shew, that the Scripture every where appropriates *this* to our Lord Christ, who being God as well as man, knows our hearts, and hears our prayers, has merit enough to purchase, interest enough to procure, nay, power sufficient to grant and bestow whatever we ask and stand in need of. He is sure of good success, whatever cause and person he becomes an advocate for.

“Father, I know, that thou hearest me always,” says our Saviour, John xi. 42.

“Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,” Matth. xi. 28.

Again, John xiv. 6: “No man cometh to the Father, but by me.”

And Eph. ii. 18: “Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.”

So Eph. iii. 12: “In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.”

But there cannot be a clearer and fuller proof to this purpose, than 1 Tim. ii. 5: “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.” And,

In 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6: “For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.”

Here, in opposition to the Pagan idolatry, that, together with one supreme God, worshipped many other inferior deities, either as subordinate governors of the world, or as mediators and intercessors for them with the supreme God, the Apostle asserts, that to us Christians “there is but one God, the Maker of all things; and one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus,” to be the object of our worship. In both which places, it is very evident the word *εἷς*, *one*, signifies one only, *one* Mediator, in the same sense that there is *one* God, and you may as well make to yourselves more gods than one, as more mediators than one.

Nor will their distinction of a mediator of redemption and a mediator of intercession be here of any use to them. For,

1. The Apostle asserts absolutely, without any reserve or distinction, there is *one* God and *one* Mediator. To distinguish where the Apostle does not, is not to speak the Apostle’s sense, but their own, and to serve a cause instead of truth.

2. The Apostle opposes the one Mediator to the plurality of dæmons and mediators among the heathens : now all that the heathens attributed to their dæmons or mediators, was intercession only : so that this distinction, had it been thought of in that age, would have served the heathens' turn as well as the Papists, and it would have been as good an answer from the one as the other ; Christ is a Mediator of redemption, but ours mediators only of intercession.

3. A mediator of mere intercession is a great lessening and reproach to the nature and perfections of God. It brings down God to the meanness of earthly princes, as if he, like them, dispensed his favours by the direction of others, and at their importunity ; as if he knew not when to do good, and was not always ready to do it, but wanted the information and solicitation of others ; and governed himself more by measures taken from some favourites in the court of heaven, than by his own infinite wisdom and goodness.

We indeed are commanded to pray to God, to pray for others, and to beg one another's prayers : but this we do not to inform God, but to pay our homage and worship to him ; not as relying on any interest or power we or others can have in God, but on his goodness, and the truth of his promises, that reach alike to all good men ; and in doing this, we give glory to God, by owning his absolute sovereignty over us, and declaring his goodness and faithfulness to the world : but to pray to saints and angels as mediators of intercession, is to suppose that they have upon the account of their own merit and worth, that power and interest in God, as seldom or never to be demed ; or at least, that the surest and most likely way to obtain our petitions, is first to petition them to offer them up to God. But now the more of such power and interest we think they have in God, the more shall we place our hope and confidence in them ; and the more we trust and depend on them, the less shall we trust and depend on God : and is not this to take from God, and give to his creature, and to divide our hope and confidence betwixt them ? and if faith and hope are any parts of religious worship, we give his glory to others, whilst we give part of that worship to them, that is solely and peculiarly God's.

4. No one can be a mediator of intercession, that is not a mediator of redemption too ; to be a mediator of intercession in the behalf of an offending person to his provoked lord, it is requisite that he be no offender against him himself ; that he

has a greater interest in him than the person he intercedes for, that this interest is founded on the merit of some services performed to him ; by which services, the honour and reputation of his government is as much retrieved, as it was injured by the other's offence and disobedience, otherwise he is no more likely to prevail for him, than the offender is for himself ; having both by their sin forfeited their right and interest in God's favour, and not having done any thing to make that atonement for them, that his justice and wisdom, as Governor of the world, has made fit and necessary.

Now such a mediator or advocate with the Father in the behalf of sinful man can none be, but Christ our Lord, who, when by our transgressions we had provoked God, and brought contempt upon his laws and authority, suffered death to make a propitiation for our sins ; and by his perfect obedience and sufferings, restored that honour and reverence to his authority and government that we had vilified and despised ; and now in virtue of his meritorious blood he makes intercession for us, not as an ordinary supplicant, relying wholly on mercy, but as a powerful mediator, urging his own merits ; having purchased what he begs for, having atoned for what he prays for, his intercessions for us are never denied, nor our prayers in his name, for his sake.

5. We may observe therefore, that the Scripture makes Christ's intercession to depend on his propitiation ; so it follows in this chapter, ver. 6, the Apostle having said there is one Mediator, adds, "who gave himself a ransom for all." So Rom. viii. 33 : "who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect ? it is God that justifieth ; who is he that condemneth ? it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." So 1 John ii. 1, 2 : "if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous ; and he is the propitiation for our sins."

This may farther appear from the analogy there is and ought to be betwixt the Jewish and Christian worship ; St. Paul frequently in his epistles, especially that to the Hebrews, makes the legal priesthood typical of the evangelical : now if under that dispensation the priests were not to make intercession for the people, without a sacrifice first offered up, to atone and propitiate for their sins ; then it follows, that under the Gospel we can have no other Mediator than one, who brings a sacrifice along with him ; and that only has our Lord done,

who is both our priest and our sacrifice, who hath offered up himself on the cross a sacrifice for our sins, and now intercedes in the merits of his own blood, and the propitiation he hath made.

Thus, as you see, the Apostle in this text excludes wholly angels and saints from being mediators of intercession. I shall only add, that in another place he as plainly condemns it, and forewarns Christians against it; 1 Tim. iv. 1, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils," *Διδασκαλίας Δαιμονίων*, the doctrine of *dæmons*, that is, of worshipping *dæmons* as mediators between God and man.* This is an exact prophecy of what the Church of Rome teaches and practises as to the worship of angels and saints departed, but the Apostle calls it an apostasy or departing from the faith of Christ

The conclusion of all is this: we believe that the blessed saints and angels love us, pray for us, are willing to help us, and do what they can and are permitted to do towards our happiness; but from hence it does not follow that they are so concerned in the government of the world, and administration of human affairs, as to make it lawful for us to make them sharers with God in any part of his worship: they have not, as we know of, a general and universal knowledge of us and our condition; they have no power of themselves, either to hear or help us; without God's leave, if not without God's command, they can do nothing; and therefore whilst we honour their memories, and bless God for what grace and glory he hath bestowed upon them; we, as the holy Scripture hath taught us, think ourselves obliged religiously to adore and pray to God alone.

SOLI DEO GLORIA.

* Mr. Mede on the place.

BOOK V.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME JUSTLY CON-
DEMNED, AS DIRECTING THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES
AND RELICS.

THE FALLIBILITY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

DEMONSTRATED,

FROM THE MANIFEST ERROR OF THE SECOND NICENE AND
TRENT COUNCILS: WHICH ASSERT THAT THE VENERATION
AND HONORARY WORSHIP OF IMAGES, IS A TRADITION
PRIMITIVE AND APOSTOLICAL.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

To that which I have said in the close of this Discourse, touching the infallibility of the second Nicene Council, and her authority in proposing articles of faith, interpreting of holy Scripture, and in declaring what was the tradition of the Church of Christ, I think fit here, by way of preface, to add these things:

1. That if she hath a just and an assured title to these privileges, then must she be infallible in the interpretations of these following Scriptures.

*“ Let not a clergyman, from the time present, be placed in two Churches, this being an argument of filthy lucre, and

* Κληρικὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος μὴ κατατασσέσθω ἐν δυσὶν ἐκκλησίαις· ἐμπορείας γὰρ καὶ αἰσχροκερδείας ἴδιον τοῦτο, καὶ ἑτεροῦ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς συνήθειας· ἠκούσαμεν γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς κυριακῆς φωνῆς, ὅτι οὐ δύναται τις δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεῖν, ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισήσει, καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει· ἢ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀντίκειται, καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει· ἕκαστος οὖν κατὰ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν φωνήν, ἐν ᾗ ἐκκληθεῖ, ἐν τούτῳ ὀφείλει μένειν καὶ προσεδρεύειν ἐν μιᾷ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Τὰ γὰρ δι' αἰσχροκερδεῖαν γινόμενα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ἁλλότρια τοῦ Θεοῦ καθεστήκασι. 2 Nic. Conc. Can. 15. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 7. p. 609. Lut. Par. 1671.]

alien from the ecclesiastical custom : for we have heard from our Lord's mouth, that no man can serve two masters ; for he will either hate the one, and love the other ; or he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. Let therefore every one, according to the Apostle's injunction, remain in that calling wherein he was called, and place himself in one Church only ; for those things which are done in ecclesiastical affairs for filthy lucre, are alien from God." Now either those words of St. Paul do really command all clergymen to abide in that Church, in which at first they were placed ; and those words of Christ do, in their true and proper sense, forbid them to have two benefices with cure, or two churches under their care, or they do not so : if they do, then do the Doctors of the Church of Rome continually practise what is forbid by Christ, and as continually neglect what is commanded by St. Paul ; we also have, according to the determination of this Council, a full conviction that they are generally addicted to filthy lucre, and are, above all other clergy, transgressors of ecclesiastical custom. If these texts do not bear the sense here put upon them, then hath this Council erred in their interpretation of these Scriptures ; and if they have so evidently erred in those interpretations of the Scripture, which concern the manners and duty of the Christian clergy ; why may they not err also in those things which concern their faith ? Moreover, it being evident and confessed, that the command to tell the Church, especially concerns offences against good manners ; and that our Lord's promise is to be with those guides, "teaching men to observe those things he hath commanded ;" surely it must be evident, that these texts are impertinently alleged for the infallibility of General Councils, in their interpretations of the holy Scripture, if they do not prove the infallibility of this General Council in the interpretation of these Scriptures.

Secondly, This Council, in her second canon, speaketh thus :* "Since when we sing, we promise to meditate in the judgments of the Lord, and not forget his words;† it is most wholesome that all Christians should observe this, but espe-

* Ἐπειδήπερ ψάλλοντες συντασσόμεθα τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασί σου μελετήσω, οὐκ ἐπιλήσσομαι τῶν λόγων σου, πάντα μὲν Χριστιανούς ταῦτα φυλάττειν σωτήριον καὶ ἐξαιρετον, τοῖς δὲ ἱερατικῇ ἀμπεχομένους ἀξίαν, ἐνθεν ὀρίζομεν πάντα τὸν προάγεσθαι μέλλοντα εἰς τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς βαθμὸν πάντως τὸ ψαλτήριον γινώσκειν. 2 Nic. Concil. Can. 2. [Ibid. p. 596.]

† Psal. cxix. 16.

cially the hierarchy: and therefore we command that all who are promoted to a bishopric, should altogether know the Psalter." Now I desire to know of the Romish doctors, how they will reconcile the sense here given of the Psalmist's words, with their public singing in an unknown tongue? For if it be wholesome that all Christians should observe this, and if it be certain that they cannot do it, unless they do entirely know the Psalter: it is also certain, that when the Psalter is only sung in Latin, all Christians cannot meditate in these judgments of the Lord, how wholesome soever it may be to them so to do. Again, if the forementioned privileges did certainly belong unto this Council, then must she also be infallible in these following decisions, *viz.*

1. In that of canon the third, which runs thus: * "All elections made by princes, of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, shall be void, according to that rule which saith, if any bishop, by using the secular powers, obtain a bishopric, let him be deposed; and they who do communicate with him, let them be excommunicated." According to which canon, all the elections of French and English bishops must be void, and all Christian princes must be deprived of their just prerogative in this affair.

2. In their first canon they confirm all the "canons† of the Apostles, and of the six holy and œcumenical Synods, and also of the topical Councils assembled to make such determinations; and of the holy Fathers, because all these being enlightened by one and the same Spirit, decreed things expedient; whom therefore they anathematized, deposed, or separated from communion, we also do anathematize, depose, and separate from communion." And in particular, they frequently anathematize and condemn among the list of heretics‡ Pope

* Πᾶσαν ψῆφον γινομένην παρὰ ἀρχόντων ἐπισκόπου, ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ἢ διακόνου, ἄκυρον μένειν κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα, Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι χρῆσάμενος, δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατῆς ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καθαιρεῖσθω καὶ ἀφοριζέσθω, καὶ οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ πάντες. Ibid. Can. 3. [Ibid. p. 597.]

† Τῶν ἐκτεθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων, τῶν τε ἔξ ἁγίων οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων, καὶ τῶν τοπικῶς συναθροισθεισῶν ἐπὶ ἐκδόσει τοιούτων διαταγμάτων, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐξ ἐνόφου γὰρ ἅπαντες, καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἀγασθέντες ὥρισαν τὰ συμφέροντα. Καὶ οὗς μὲν ἀναθέματι παραπέμπουσι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀναθεματίζομεν, &c. [Ibid. p. 596.]

‡ Vid. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 556, 588. Vid. Act. 3. [Ibid.] p. 165, 181. Act. 6. [Ibid.] p. 421.

Honorius. Now if all these canons be not to be received, either as to matters of faith or manners; then hath this Synod dangerously erred in determining, that they were all to be received, as being made by men enlightened by the Holy Ghost in their decisions. If they be to be thus esteemed, to omit at present infinite advantages, which this concession gives to our cause, then was the sixth Council in Trullo assisted by the Holy Ghost to determine thus:

1. * “Because we know that in the Roman Church they have made a canon, that they who are to be ordained priests, or deacons, shall promise no more to accompany with their wives: we, following the old canon of Apostolical appointment, will have the conjugal society of holy men, according to the laws still firm and valid, by no means dissolving their conjugal society with their wives, nor defrauding them of the enjoyment of each other at times convenient. If therefore any person be found worthy to be ordained subdeacon, deacon, or priest, let him by no means be hindered from receiving these orders, because he lives with his lawful wife; nor shall any man require him to promise, that after his ordination he will abstain from conjugal duties, lest by so doing we become injurious to that marriage which God ordained, and our Lord blessed with his presence. The voice of the Gospel crying out, ‘What God hath joined, let no man put asunder;’ and the Apostle teaching, ‘That marriage is honourable, and the bed undefiled;’ and saying, ‘Art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed.’”

2. When they determine thus:† “Renewing the canon made by the General Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, we decree, that the chair of Constantinople shall enjoy equal privileges with that of Rome, and be magnified in ecclesiastical matters, as that is.”

3. When they decree thus:‡ “Since we have understood,

* Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδεδοσθαι διεγνώμεν τοὺς μέλλοντας διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου χειροτονίας ἀξιωνισθαι καθομολογεῖν, ὥς οὐκέτι ταῖς αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταῖς, ἡμεῖς. Syn. Trull. Can. 13. [Balsam. Can. Apost. &c. p. 374. Par. 1620.]

† Ὅρίζομεν, ὥστε τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαβεῖν πρεσβειῶν τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνου, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς ὡς ἐκείνων μεγαλονεῖσθαι πράγμασι. Ibid. Can. 36. [p. 401.]

‡ Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει, ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ἡμέραις, καὶ νηστείαις τοῖς ταύτης σάββασιν νη-

that in the city of Rome they fast on Saturdays in Lent, against the tradition of the Church ; it seemed good to the holy Synod, that the canon which saith, if any clergyman be found fasting on the Lord's day, or any Saturday, except one only, let him be deposed ; if any layman, let him be excommunicated ; shall be inviolably observed in the Church of Rome also." And,

4. " When in their first canon they anathematize Pope Honorius ; that is, they by God's Spirit were assisted in the first decree, to condemn the practice and constitutions of the Church of Rome of that age ; and much more the practice of the present Church of Rome, as contrary to the voice of Christ and his Apostles : in the second, to decree against the Pope's supremacy : in the third, to charge the Church of Rome with walking contrary to the tradition of the whole Church besides, and give laws to rectify that abuse : in the fourth, to declare not only that a General Council may be infallible without the confirmation, or even concurrence of the Pope, but also may infallibly condemn him for an heretic."

Moreover, in this Nicene Council, this pleasant story is twice related, *viz.* " That a certain monk being haunted with the spirit of fornication (a spirit too familiar with such professors of continency), who vehemently urged him to uncleanness, the old man miserably cried out, How long will it be ere thou let me alone? thou hast been with me even to old age. Then the devil visibly appearing, said, Swear to me thou wilt tell nobody what I shall now say to thee, and I will tempt thee no more. Then the monk swore by the High God, that he would tell no man what the devil should say. Whereupon Satan spoke thus to him : Worship thou no more the image of the blessed Virgin with her Son in her arms, and I will no more molest thee. The monk hearing this, notwithstanding his oath, goes the next day to Abbot Theodore, and tells him all that the devil said. And the abbot commending him for it, farther told him, That it was better for him to frequent all the stews in the city, than to deny to worship, by that image, the Lord and his holy mother. And when the devil comes again, and taxeth the monk with perjury, he tells the devil, that he knew it very well, but rests satisfied in this, that it was only perjury against his God and Maker." Where note,

στείναι παρὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὥστε κρατεῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρσα-
λεύτως τὸν κανόνα, &c. Can. 5. [Can. 55.] [Ibid. p. 427.]

1. That this ridiculous tale is so acceptable to that good Synod, that they command it to be read, Act the 4th;* and Act the 5th they make a repetition of it.

2. That they condemn the monk's oath,† as being ὄρκος αἰσεβήτης, a wicked oath; and, ὁ ψευδὴς ὄρκος, a false oath, and so not binding; and say, "That it was better to forswear himself, than to keep an oath for the destruction of images;" and seem all pleased with the decision of Abbot Theodore. Now if this be good divinity, then is it better to be perjured, and take the sacred name of God in vain, than not to worship images; yea, it is better to commit fornication, and make the members of Christ the members of an harlot, than not to adore the works of men's hands.

Now every body knows, that perjury and fornication are sins against the law of nature; and that no law of nature doth command the veneration of the images of Christ, or of his blessed mother: that Christ and his Apostles said expressly, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself; thou shalt not commit adultery;" but never said, thou shalt worship images: who then can want discretion sufficient to discern, that this determination made in the Synod, without the exception of one person, must be false?

It would be endless to reckon all the idle dreams, and foolish stories, produced by this Synod, in favour of their images. But it is also needless, seeing the Council of Frankfort hath well observed,‡ "that when these Fathers perceived that their doctrine by no means would accord with Scripture, they turned themselves to apocryphal and ridiculous tales."

And Espenceæus§ doth ingenuously confess, "that the Greeks defended images with the apparitions of devils, and the dreams of women, as is to be seen in the Nicene Council."

3. Observe, that from the Epistle of Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, cited with approbation by this Nicene Synod, we learn not only, "that the people then received the sacrament in both kinds, but also that they received both according

* [Ut supra,] p. 252, 381.

† Ibid. p. 253.

‡ Illi cum errore suo Scripturas Divinas cohærere minime posse senserunt, ad Apocryphas quasdam, et risu dignas nœnias pedem verterunt. Libr. Carol. l. 3. c. 30.

§ Græci, qui Imagines defendebant, Dæmonum spectris et muliebribus somniis parum verecunde abusi sunt, ut in Nicæna Synodo videre licet. Comment. in 2 ad Tim. p. 155.

to Christ's own tradition,* for the commemoration of his death, and of his resurrection; and that they were divinely moved with an insatiable desire of partaking of his holy body and blood:" which shews, that then they held our Lord's tradition, and the memorial of his death obliged the common people to receive both kinds; and that their desire of both, was a desire inspired by God. And then, what inspiration must that be, which moved the Councils of Constance, Basil, and Trent, to hinder them of the enjoyment of the cup, and even to forbid them to desire it, it is not difficult to determine.

4. Observe, that one reason which the Fathers of this Council give for the worship of the image of Christ, is this, because† "he himself was not sensibly present with us, but only present as to his divinity;" and that he was not to remain with us‡ *σωματικῶς*, corporeally.

They therefore could not believe transubstantiation, or his corporeal presence in the sacrament, for having that still kept upon the altar, or in the *piscis* or *ciborium*, had they believed Christ was corporeally present in it, they must have also thought that he remained still corporeally present with his disciples, and his Church on earth, and not denied such a presence with them as they plainly do; and must have owned some other presence of our Saviour with us, than that of his Deity, which yet apparently they do not. Moreover, they pronounce,§ *anathema* "against all persons who do not profess that our Lord was circumscribed as to his humanity;" and therefore they pronounced this anathema on all who held, that his humanity was present in the sacrament, by way of transubstantia-

* *Πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν μέγαλησιν τοῦ παναγίου αὐτοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος, δι' ὧν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ τελοῦμεν παράδοσιν ἀκορέστῃ ἐπιθυμίᾳ, καὶ θεοκινήτῃ σπουδῇ κατεπείγονται, μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων ἢ ἐλαφοῦ.* Apud Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 314.

† *Ὡς μὴ παρόντος βασιλέως ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ τιμᾶται, ὥστε καὶ ἀρτίως τοῦ δεσπότου τῶν ὅλων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰσθητῶς ἡμῖν μὴ παρόντος (ἀξίατον γάρ ἐστι τοῖς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὀφθαλμοῖς, ὡς δὲ Θεὸς πάντων πάρεστι) τιμητὶον τὴν αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα.* Anastas. apud Syn. Nic. 2. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 305.

‡ *Ὁ γὰρ ἐκείνοις σωματικῶς παραμένειν ἡμελλεν ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος παρελεύσεως.* Epist. Germani Episcopi Constantionop. apud Syn. Nic. 2. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 305.

§ *Εἰ τις Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν περιγραφτὸν οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπινόν, ἀνάθεμα.* Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 578.

tion, since it is agreed on all hands, that his body is not there circumscribed, or present, after the manner of a body.

And so much for the observations which concern the things delivered in the second Nicene Council. What follows from the doctrine here established, against the tenets of the Romish Church, and the assertions of the Guide of Controversies, is as followeth.

1. Hence it is evident, that* “in judges subordinate dissenting, there is no universal practice obliging us to adhere to the superior, or in those of the same order and dignity, to the major part.” For neither could Christians be obliged to adhere to this false decision of the Pope, and second Nicene Council; nor did the Councils of Frankfort, Paris, or the German, French, or British Churches, think themselves obliged so to do.

2. Here also it is evident, in the judgment of these Councils and Churches, that † “the subordinate clergy may be a guide to Christians, when opposing the superior;” for so the Councils and Churches thought themselves, when they opposed the Pope of Rome, and the decrees of the second Nicene Council; and so undoubtedly they were, provided the decisions of that Council, approved by the Pope, be false.

3. Here also is demonstrated the falseness of that assertion of R. H. ‡ “that Christians ought to submit to the decision of such Church-guides, declaring the sense of the Fathers;” the sense which was imposed on them by the Nicene Synod being notoriously false, and by the forementioned Councils and Churches declared so to be.

4. Hence it follows,§ that “if acceptance of a considerable part of Church-governors absent from any Council, is that, and only that, which renders it equivalent to a General Council,” the second Nicene Council, for 500 years after their sitting, could not be General, seeing the greatest part of the western Church-governors were absent from it, and for 500 years did not accept of its decrees, but reject, condemn, and abhor them; and how it should become, after so long a period, what for so many years it was not, I am yet to learn.

5. Hence it must follow, that if according to R. H. || “all persons dissenting from, and opposing a known definition of

* R. H. Disc. 2. c. 3. sect. 23. p. 100.

† R. H. Disc. 1. c. 3.

‡ Disc. 2. c. 9. sect. 19.

§ R. H. Disc. 3. c. 2. sect. 13.

|| Disc. 3. c. 3. sect. 16.

the Church in matters of faith, be heretics :” then must that of the second Nicene Council be no definition of the Church in matters of faith ; or all the forementioned Councils and Churches, that so long dissented from, and opposed it, must have been heretics during that whole time ; and consequently the Pope himself, and all that communicated with them, for five centuries, must be unchurched also.

6. Hence we demonstratively learn, that Councils by the Church of Rome reputed General, may confidently pronounce anathemas, put their decrees into their creeds, and call men heretics who disown them, as did the second Nicene Council ; when yet it is extremely evident, that their decrees are false, their anathemas wicked and unjust ; and they whom they style heretics, may be good and orthodox professors of Christianity.

7. Hence it appears, how absurdly,* R. H. and other Romanists assert, that none “ can be sufficient judges of the misarguings of Councils, unless it be some following Councils of the same authority ; and that private men can by no better way learn what is tradition, but from the Church speaking by her Councils ; and that Apostolical tradition cannot be known but by the judgment of the present Church :” for sure our reason was given us for little purpose, if it cannot serve us to discover that this Nicene Council hath argued amiss, and delivered that as Apostolical tradition, which was far from being truly such.

8. Hence also we may learn the vanity of the objections framed against the use of reason, in judging of the truth or falsehood of things defined by such Councils, *viz.* that “ it is great pride for private persons to oppose their judgments to the definition of a General Council ; to think they can see clearly, what so many persons could not see :” with many other things of a like nature, urged with much rhetoric, but with more weakness, by the Roman Catholics ; for in such cases as these are, the private person doth not rely upon his private judgment, but on his judgment concurring with the judgment of all learned Protestants in this and former ages, and of the whole Church of Christ for six centuries ; and with the major part of the Western Church for so many more ; and with the confessions of many learned persons of the Church of Rome : and what absurdity is it to prefer the judgment of so many,

joined with the clearest evidence of Scripture ; what pride to follow the evidence produced here, let any reasonable person judge.

Lastly, Because some persons take the liberty to say, “ the Church of Rome, and her Councils, do not require men to venerate, to worship, or bow down to images ;” let them know that their* Trent Council hath decreed, *eis debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam esse*, that due honour and veneration is to be imparted to them, according to the definition of the second Nicene Council.

And that the Fathers of that Council generally say, τὰς σεπτὰς εἰκόνας σέβουμαι καὶ προσκυνῶ,† “ I worship and adore the sacred images, and anathematize those who do not so confess or practise.”

In the seventh session they declare, we should ‡ ταύταις ἀσπασμόν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν, “ salute and give them honorary worship.” In the same session they declare, “ that it is without doubt acceptable, and well-pleasing to God, προσκυνεῖν καὶ ἀσπάζεσθαι, to worship and salute the images of Christ, the blessed Virgin ; of angels and all saints ;” adding, that “ if any one doubt, or be wavering, touching the worship of holy images, § τοῦτον ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμένη ἡμῶν Σύνοδος, our holy Synod, assisted by the Holy Ghost, doth anathematize him.”

The || Roman Catechism enjoins the parish priest to declare, “ that images of saints are placed in the Church, *ut colantur*, that they may be worshipped ;” and they have forced those who held the contrary, to renounce it as heresy. When therefore any English or French Papists tell us, that they do not venerate, or bow down to images ; or that the Church of Rome doth not enjoin them so to do, they either know not what their Church doth teach, or wilfully prevaricate ; all Roman Catholics being obliged by these Councils, and taught by this Catechism, to pay this veneration and worship to them.

* Sess. 25. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 895.]

† Act. 2. [Ibid. vol. 7.] p. 130, 132, 133, 136. Act. 3. [Ibid.] p. 188, 189, 192.

‡ [Ibid.] p. 555.

§ Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 584. Vid. Act. 4. p. 248.

|| Part 3. ch. 2. sect. 24. [De Invoc. Sanct. sect. 40. p. 363. Mechlin. 1831.]

CHAP. I.

The Fathers of the Nicene and Trent Councils teach, that Image-worship is a tradition of the Apostles, received by all Christians from the beginning, §. 1. The Councils of Constantinople and Frankfort, in the same age, say, it was the tradition of the Apostles, and the Fathers, that Images were not to be worshipped, §. 2. This last assertion is proved, 1st, from express testimonies of the Fathers, saying, they had no such custom or tradition : that Christ and his doctrine taught them to reject and abandon Images ; and, that they taught all their converts to condemn them, §. 3. 2ndly, That Image-worship was by them represented as an heathenish custom, it being, say they, proper to the heathens to make and worship them, and proper to Christians to renounce the worship of them, §. 4. 3rdly, When heathens objected this to Christians, that they had no images or statues ; yea, that they laughed at those who had them ; they own and justify the thing, §. 5. 4thly, they commend the policy of the Jews for having none, and the wisdom of those Gentiles who had none ; and held it a mark of their own excellency that they had them not ; and that they shut their eyes when they worshipped, that they might not see any sensible object, §. 6. 5thly, They answer and reject those very pleas when used by heathens, which afterwards were used by the Nicene Council, and the Romish Church, in the behalf of Image-worship, §. 7. 6thly, These Fathers represent the having Images of Christ, and of his Saints, for worship, as a thing proper to the vilest heretics, §. 8.

Amongst the many evidences that might be easily produced to shew, that the pretended General Councils of the Church of Rome, have, with great vanity, and most apparent falsehood, defined, that they received the doctrines, which they endeavoured to impose upon the Christian world, from Primitive and Apostolical tradition ; one is, the veneration or honorary worship of the images of Christ, his Virgin Mother, the Martyrs, and the Saints departed : for the second Nicene Council, and the chief bishops mentioned, or residing in it, do very frequently, but also very falsely say, “that the doctrine there declared and required, touching the adoration of images,

is Apostolical from the beginning, and that which hath been always practised by the Church of Christ."

§. 1. Pope Gregory II. having, like a true infallible interpreter of Scripture, told us, that in that expression of our Lord's,* "where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together:" by the carcass was to be understood Christ, and by the eagles, religious men, and lovers of him: he adds,† "that these religious men flew like eagles to Jerusalem; and having seen our Lord, and James his brother, and Stephen the first martyr, they painted them as they had seen them: and that men no sooner beheld them, but leaving the worship of the devil, they fell immediately to worship these images; not indeed with latria; but with relative worship."

Pope Hadrian saith, that "all orthodox and Christian emperors, all priests and religious servants of God, and the whole company of Christians, observed the veneration of images and pictures, for memory of pious compunction, and even till then worshipped them, as they received a tradition from the beginning from the holy Fathers to do.‡ That the special honour, adoration, and veneration of them, was delivered by the holy Apostles. And that throughout the whole world, wherever Christianity was planted, these venerable images were honoured by all the faithful."

Tharasius, patriarch of Constantinople, declares that this of the venerable images "was the tradition of the whole catholic Church of God from the beginning."§

Gregory, bishop of Possene, cites for it a synod of the Apostles met at Antioch,|| "commanding Christians no longer to err about idols, but instead of them, to paint the image of Christ, God and man."

And Leo, bishop of Rhodes¶ adds, that "the holy and vener-

* Ὁ Χριστὸς δὲ τὸ πτώμα, αἱ τοὶ οἱ Θεοσεβεῖς καὶ φιλόχριστοι ἄνθρωποι. Concil. Nic. 2. Con. tom. 7. p. 12.

† Ταύτας προσεκύνησαν οὐ λατρευτικῶς, ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς. [Ibid.] p. 13.

‡ Sicut a primordio traditionem a sanctis patribus susceperunt, Act. 2. [Ibid.] p. 103. Hoc enim traditum est a sanctis Apostolis. [Ibid.] p. 110 & p. 99. In universo mundo ubi Christianitas est, ipsæ S. Imagines ab omnibus fidelibus honorantur. [Ibid.] p. 106.

§ Παραδοθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῆθεν χρόνων. Act. 5. [Ibid.] p. 348 & 388.

|| Ἀλλ' ἀντικονίζειν τὴν θεανδρικήν στήλην τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Act. 1. [Ibid.] p. 64.

¶ Κατὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων συνήθειαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. Ibid.

able images were to be in the Church, according to the custom delivered of old times from the Apostles."

And at the conclusion of many of their actions, the Fathers* generally affirm, that they embraced and practised the worship of images, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν, according to the tradition of the holy Apostles; and καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται γινόμενοι τοῦ λόγου,† "as they delivered to them, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses of the word."

Yea, the whole Synod doth frequently assert they were taught thus to judge of the adoration of images by the holy Fathers, and by their doctrine delivered by God.‡ That their tradition concerning it, was ἐν Θεοῦ παράδοσις,§ the divine tradition of the catholic Church. And that in defining and asserting it, they followed the doctrine of the holy Fathers taught them by God, and the tradition of the catholic Church, and knew this was the doctrine of that Holy Spirit which dwelt in her.|| That they followed in observing this tradition, St. Paul and the whole Apostolical college; and that thus the doctrine of the holy Fathers was confirmed, thus the tradition of the catholic Church, τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα δεξαμένης τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, from one end of the Christian world to the other, held and practised.¶ That this was the doctrine received from the first founders of the Christian faith, and their divine successors.** And lastly, they do often with full voice cry out, αὐτὴ ἡ πίστις τῶν Ἀποστόλων—τῶν πατέρων—τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, "this is the faith of the Apostles, this is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of the orthodox, this is that faith which establisheth the world."††

And suitable to this is the language of the Trent Council, which commands all bishops, and others, whose office it is to instruct the people, to teach them diligently, that "the images

* Act. 2. [Ibid.] p. 132, 133, 136, 152, 153. Act. 3. p. 188. Act. 4. p. 328. Act. 5. p. 389. Act. 7. p. 576.

† Act. 2. [Ibid.] p. 145.

‡ Παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν Θεοπαράδοτου διδασκαλίας. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 321.

§ Act 7. [Ibid.] p. 553. β.

|| Ἐπακολουθοῦντες τῇ Θεηγόρῃ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τοῦ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐνοικήσαντος ἁγίου πνεύματος εἶναι ταύτην γινώσκουμεν. [Ibid.] p. 556.

¶ Πᾶσιν τῇ θείᾳ ἀποστολικῇ ὁμηγύρει. Ibid. item p. 588.

** Παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πρωτάρχων τῆς ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας. [Ibid.] p. 581.

†† Ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος ἐξεβόησεν. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 576. Act. 8. p. 592.

of Christ, the mother of God, and other saints, are especially to be had and retained in temples; and that due honour and veneration is to be given to them, because the honour tendered to them, is referred to the prototype; so that by the images which they kiss, before which they uncover their heads, and prostrate themselves, they worship Christ, and venerate the saints, whose similitude they are." And this, say they, is done "according to the custom of the catholic and apostolic Church, received from the first age of the Christian faith, and the consent of the holy Fathers."*

§. 2. On the other hand, the Council of Constantinople, consisting of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, assembled in the year 754, declares that "this evil invention of images neither hath its being from the tradition of Christ, or his Apostles, nor of the holy Fathers."† And having forbidden all Christians to worship any, or to place an image in the Church, or in private houses, they conclude unanimously thus: αὐτῇ ἡ πίστις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, — τῶν πατέρων, — τῶν ὀρθοδόξων;‡ "this is the faith of the Apostles; this is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of the orthodox."

The Council of Frankfort, consisting of three hundred bishops, assembled by Charles the Great, out of Italy, Germany, and France, A.D. 794, declares that the second Nicene Council had offended in two things. § 1. In decreeing that images should be worshipped. And, 2. In saying falsely, that this was delivered to them from the Apostles. They add, that "leaving the traditions of the ancient Fathers, who decreed that images should not be worshipped, they endeavoured to bring into the Church new and unusual customs."|| That they endeavoured to bring into Christian religion the new adoration of images,¶ "without the doctrine of the holy

* Juxta Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum, a primævis Christianæ Religionis temporibus receptum, sanctorumque Patrum consensionem. Sess. 25. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 895.]

† Οὐτε ἐκ παραδόσεως Χριστοῦ ἢ Ἀποστόλων ἢ πατέρων τὸ εἶναι ἔχει. Concil. Nic. 2. [Ibid. vol. 7.] p. 452. εἰκόνα ἢ προσκυνῆσαι ἢ στήσαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. [Ibid.] p. 508.

‡ Ibid. p. 532.

§ Quia ut hoc facerent, ab Apostolis sibi traditum mentiebantur. Lib. Carol. 1. 2. c. 25, 27. [p. 228, 241. ed. 1549.]

|| Relictis priscorum Patrum traditionibus, qui imagines non colere sanxerunt, novas conari et insolitas Ecclesiæ consuetudines inferre. Præfat. in Lib. 1. [Ibid. p. 9.]

¶ Absque sanctorum Patrum doctrina et consacerdotum per diversas mundi partes consensu. L. 4. c. 21. [Ibid. p. 606.]

Fathers, and the consent of their fellow-priests throughout the world. That this of image-worship was *impudentissima traditio*,* a most impudent tradition. And that this pretended tradition was "neither to be found in the oracles of the Prophets, nor in the writings of the Gospels, nor in the doctrines of the Apostles, nor in the relations of the former holy Synods, nor in the doctrines of the orthodox Fathers."† That it was instituted by them, *nullo antiquitatis documento vel exemplo*, without all instruction, or example from antiquity.

A Synod held at Paris under Ludovicus Pius and Lotharius, A.D. 824, saith, "that the second Nicene Council declared for image worship against the divine authority, and the sayings of the holy Fathers.‡ And that they determine against the worship of them according to divine authority, and, *juxta sententias sanctorum Patrum*, according to the judgments of the holy Fathers.§

Agobardus, bishop of Lyons, having declared against all image-worship, saith this is sincere religion, *is mos Catholicus, hæc antiqua Patrum traditio*;|| this is the Catholic custom, this is the tradition of the Fathers; as is easily proved even out of the Book of Sacraments which the Roman Church useth. And again, "None of the ancient Catholics did ever think that images were to be worshipped or adored."¶

Ilincmarus, archbishop of Rheims, informs us that this Nicene Synod was condemned and evacuated by a General Synod called by the Emperor Charles the Great,** according to the way of the Scripture and the tradition of the ancients. Aimoinus†† also complains of them, that they had decreed touching the adoration of images, *aliter quam orthodoxi Patres antea definierant*, otherwise than the orthodox Fathers had before defined.

* Præfat. p. 10.

† Neque in Evangeliorum tonitruis, neque in Apostolorum dogmatibus, vel quorumlibet orthodoxorum Patrum doctrinis uspiam reperimus in-
sentam. L. 4. c. 13. [Ibid. p. 540.]

‡ Contra auctoritatem divinam et sanctorum Patrum dicta. P. 23. [p. 4. Francof. 1596.]

§ Ed. Pith. p. 25, 26. [Ibid. p. 7.]

|| L. de Imag. sect. 30. p. 263. [Par. 1666.]

¶ Nullus antiquorum Catholicorum unquam eas colendas vel adorandas fore existavit. [Ibid.] p. 265.

** Secundum Scripturarum tramitem, traditionemque majorum. Opusc. 5. cap. 20. [p. 93. Lut Par. 1615.]

†† De Gestis Franc. Lib. 5. cap. 28. [p. 320. Par. 1603.]

“In that Synod,” saith Roger Hoveden, “it was confirmed that images should be adored; which the Church of God doth wholly execrate.”*

Now in this matter let the truth lie where you please, it is sure no little prejudice against receiving any thing as a tradition upon the evidence of a few single Fathers, in matters of mere speculation, as some traditionary doctrines of the Church of Rome most surely are. That in a thing of this nature, which must be either daily practised, or omitted by the Church, whose Councils, of three hundred bishops at the least, in the same age, maintain such contradictory assertions; one saying frequently and expressly, that this was the doctrine of the Apostles, and all the ancient Fathers; the others as expressly, that it never was the doctrine of either of them. One, that this was the practice of all faithful Christians; the other, that they never found it practised by any of the orthodox professors. But though such contradictory assertions, in another case, might cause a wary person to suspend his assent to either of them; yet I am confident, that whosoever is unprejudiced, must, in this case, give in his verdict against the doctrine and assertions of the Trent and of the second Nicene Council.

§. 3. For notwithstanding all the confident assertions of these Councils, the testimonies of the ancient Fathers are so full and clear against that honour and veneration of images, which by these Councils is imposed upon all Christians, with an anathema to them who do assert, or even think the contrary, that he who doth impartially read them, and doth conclude that the whole Church of Christ did, for five hundred years and more, condemn this practice; and in plain terms, or by just consequence assert they had no such tradition, cannot sustain much loss, if he quite want the use of reason.

For, 1. The Fathers do expressly say, the Church of Christ hath no such custom or tradition. “We Christians,”† saith Theodotus, “have no tradition to form the images of saints in material colours.” An “image,”‡ saith Clemens of Alex-

* In ea Synodo confirmatum est imagines adorari debere, quod omnino Ecclesia Dei execratur. Annal. Part 1. ad Ann. 791.

† Τὰς τῶν ἁγίων ιδέας οὐκ ἐν εἰκόσιν ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναμορφοῦν παρελήφαμεν. Apud 2 Nic. Concil. Act. 6. [ut supra,] p. 492.

‡ Ἡμῖν δὲ οὐχ ὕλης αἰσθητῆς αἰσθητὸν τὸ ἀγαλμά ἐστιν. Protrept. p. 34. β. [p. 45. Venet. 1757.]

andria, "is indeed dead matter, formed by the hand of the artificer; but we (Christians) have no sensible image of sensible matter." St. Ambrose saith, that Rachel* who hid the images, is, or signifies, the Church. "Which Church knows no empty ideas, or vain figures of images, but knoweth the true substance of the Trinity." "We," saith St. Jerome,† "have but one husband, and worship but one image, to wit, the image of the invisible and omnipotent God." "We," saith St. Chrysostom,‡ "do by their writings enjoy the presence of the saints, having the images not of their bodies, but of their souls." "We have no care," saith Amphilochius,§ "to figure by colours the bodily visages of the saints in tables." So certain is it they had no such custom in the first five centuries, that,

2. They plainly tell us, that the first thing they taught their converts, was the contempt of images. "We plainly shew from the gravity or decorum of our principles, and do not hide them, as Celsus doth imagine, seeing even to those who are first entered among us, we teach the contempt of idols, and of all images,"|| saith Origen. "God,"¶ saith he, "cannot wholly overlook the Christians, because they are the men who despise images of human art, and endeavour to ascend by reason unto God himself; they transcend not only images, but the whole frame of creatures, to ascend to the God of all the world."

3. They add, that they were taught thus to abandon and forsake all images and statues by the religion they embraced, and by the doctrine of the Holy Jesus.

"The Christian doctrine,"** saith Origen, "doth not permit them to be solicitous about images and statues, or about the

* Quæ Ecclesia inanes ideas et vanas nescit simulacrorum figuras. De Fuga Sæc. c. 5. p. 246. [vol. 1. p. 429. Par. 1686.]

† Nos autem unam veneramus imaginem, etc. in Ezech. c. 16. p. 189. F. [vol. 5. p. 162. Veron. 1736.]

‡ Οὐχὶ τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ψυχῶν τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχοντες. Apud Council. Nic. Act. 6. [Ibid. p. 481.]

§ Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικά πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων διὰ χρωμάτων ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐντυποῦν. Ibid. p. 484.

|| Τοῖς πρώτοις εἰσαγομένοις καταφρόνησιν τῶν πάντων ἀγαλμάτων ἐμποίῳμεν. In Celsum, l. 3. p. 120. [vol. 1. p. 456. Par. 1733.]

¶ Τὰ μὲν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης περὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τέχνης ὑπερφρονεῖν. L. 8. p. 412. [Ibid. p. 781.] γένος ὑπερβᾶν μὲν οὐ μόνον ἀγάλματα, &c. l. 2. p. 91. [Ibid. p. 426.]

** Μὴ σπουδάζειν περὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα, καὶ τὰ ἱδρύματα. L. 5. p. 255. [Ibid. p. 604.]

works of God, but to transcend them, and to lift up the soul to the Creator.* They, by the doctrine of Jesus Christ," saith he, "are moved to relinquish all images and statues, and to look up by the Word, unto the Father." Again,† "The Christian," saith he, "doth not look upon images, for he is taught by Christ to seek nothing which is little or sensible, but only those things which are great and truly divine." He adds that‡ "the prophets had foretold of the coming of Christ, to cause them to desist from the worship of idols, and of images, and of demons.§ Other nations, as the Scythians, Africans, &c. abstain from images," saith he, "but they do it not upon the same account upon which we Jews and Christians are averse from it; for we abstain by reason of the commandment, which saith, thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, nor the similitude of any thing in heaven or earth; which things do not only cause us to reject images; but make us ready to die, rather than we will defile our conception of God with any such impiety."

Arnobius saith, that|| "Christ had elevated the Christian from fruitless signs made of vile earth to the stars, and heaven, and made us to present our prayers and supplications to the God of all things."

§. 4. 4. They say, that it was proper to the heathens to make and worship images; and it is frequent among the Fathers, to call them worshippers of images, instead of heathens, and to describe the Christian as one who hath left off, and hath renounced that practice. Clemens Alexandrinus¶ speaks to the heathens thus: "Art hath deceived you with its delusions, leading you to honour images and pictures.** We are not like the Getæ, and Cilicians, and other nations, to which we are compared by Celsus. For they provide images

* Διὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν καταλείπειν πάντα ἀγάλματα καὶ ἰδρύματα. L. 7. p. 359. [Ibid. p. 723.]

† Ἔμαθε γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μηδὲν μικρὸν, τουτέστιν αἰσθητὸν, ζητεῖν. L. 7. p. 362. [Ibid. p. 726.]

‡ Προφητεύων περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιδημίας ἀφιστάντος τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων θεραπείας.

§ Οὐ μόνον ἐκτρέπονται ἀγάλματα ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐτοίμως ἔρχονται, &c. L. 7. p. 375. [Ibid. p. 740.]

¶ Qui ab signis inertibus atque ex vilissimo formatis luto ad sydera sublevavit et celum. Adv. Gent. L. 1. p. 22.

¶ Προαγοῦσα ἐπὶ τὸ τιμᾶν καὶ προσκυνεῖν ἀγάλματα καὶ γραφάς. Admon. p. 39. A.

** Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων τιμὴν ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Θείου, ὡς ἀρμοζόντων μᾶλλον διαμονίαις. L. 3. p. 131. [Ibid. p. 469.]

for their gods; but we," saith Origen, "remove from God all honour by such things, as judging them more fit for devils." And again, he represents them as men,* who having fallen from the true knowledge of God, under a 'vain imagination of piety, worship images. And he represents the Christians, as those who by the conduct of the word, or reason, ascend from wood and stone, silver and gold, and all that was precious in the world, to the Creator of all things.† "What ensign do we bear before us," saith Tertullian, "but that first wisdom, which instructs us not to worship the frivolous works of men's hands, that abstinence whereby we do refrain from the goods of others, &c. He that will understand who are Christians, must know them by these marks and tokens."‡ "You are the men who make images of gold," saith Arnobius, "which we Christians cease to do.§ This is the doctrine of the holy prophets, which we Christians follow; this is our wisdom, which they who either worship images, or defend vain philosophy, deride."|| "Innumerable of all nations," saith Origen, "are turned to the Christian faith, not without the great hatred of those who worshipped images;" whereas they who have left all images and statues, is his description of the Christians.

Accordingly we find the Fathers still representing this as an heathenish custom.¶ "If you speak of the Greeks, and other heathens," saith Theophilus, "they are the men who worship ἀπεικονίσματα νεκρῶν ἀνθρώπων, the images of dead men."** "Helen, when she had found the cross, did worship Christ, but not the wood, because that," saith St. Ambrose, "was the error of the heathens."†† "It is no marvel," saith Eusebius,

* Φαντασίᾳ δ' εὐσεβείας ἀγάλματα σέβοντες. L. 4. p. 177. [Ibid. p. 519.]

† Quid enim insigne præferimus, nisi primam sapientiam, qua frivola humanæ manus opera non adoramus: qui vult intelligere qui sunt Christiani, istis indiciiis utatur necesse est. Ad Nat. l. 1. c. 5. [p. 43. Par. 1695.]

‡ Vos simulacra effingitis ex auro, l. 2. p. 98. Quæ quidem nos cessamus facere, l. 6. p. 189.

§ Isti qui fragilia colunt, l. 7. c. 26.

|| Eorum qui simulacra venerabantur. περὶ Ἀρχ. L. 4. c. 1.

¶ Ad Autolyc. l. 1. p. 76. [p. 28. Oxon. 1684.]

** Hic enim Gentilis est error. Orat. de Obiit. Theod. p. 61. [vol. 2. p. 1211. Par. 1690.]

†† Ὡς εἰκὸς τῶν παλαιῶν ἀπαραφύλακτῶς οἷα σωτῆρας ἑθνικῇ συνηθείᾳ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς τοῦτον τιμᾶν εἰωθότων τὸν τρόπον. Hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 18. [p. 265. Par. 1659.]

“that those of the heathens, who of old were cured by our Saviour, should do such things (*i. e.* erect his image, as did the woman cured of her bloody issue), since we have seen the images of the apostles Paul and Peter, yea, and of Christ himself, kept painted with colours on tables; for that of old they were wont imprudently, by a heathenish custom, thus to honour them whom they counted their saviours or benefactors.” This therefore was an heathenish, and not a Christian custom: for had Christians customarily had such statues and pictures, why doth Eusebius make this a badge of heathenism? Why doth he say, “It was no marvel that heathens should do thus?” If the images of Christ and his Apostles had been then common in all Christian oratories, why is it mentioned as so rare a thing that he had seen them? Why, lastly, doth he say that this was done ἀπαρφυλακτῶς, that is, according to Valesius, “imprudently and inconsiderately?” Adamantius the Manichæan, cites those words of the second commandment,* “See that you make no effigies, nor images, for I am a jealous God,” to reprehend the zeal of the God of the Old Testament; to which St. Austin answers, that† “he only quarrels with God’s zeal, because it forbade images, and so would seem to favour images; which,” saith he, “these men do to conciliate the favour of the heathens to their mad and miserable sect:” where we learn, not only that *simulacra* and *imagines* are with St. Austin the same thing, but also that it was only heathens who then favoured images, and those who had a kindness for them. Agobardus, in the 9th century saith, that‡ “to use the images of the Apostles, or our Lord himself, for the honour of religion, or any veneration, is to use them after the manner of the heathens, and that if Constantine did adore the images of St. Peter and St. Paul,§ he did it from the pestiferous custom of idolatry.” So generally and so lately was this esteemed an heathenish and idolatrous custom, by the Fathers of the Church.

§. 5. 5. This was so notorious to the heathens, that they object it to the Christians as their crime, that they had no

* Effigies et Imagines. Contra Adam. cap. 13. [vol. 8. p. 126. Par. 1688.]

† Vult ergo videri favere se simulacris, quod propterea faciunt ut miserimæ et vesanæ suæ sectæ etiam Paganorum concilient benevolentiam. Ibid.

‡ Ob religionis honorem, aut aliquam venerationem, more Gentilium De Imag. p. 248. [Par. 1666.]

§ Ex consuetudine Idololatriæ pestifera. [Ibid.] p. 252.

images, that they would not make, would not endure, much less venerate them, and that they laughed at those who did. Celsus objects, saith Origen,* that "we avoid the making of images." And again,† "In this, that they will not endure images, they are like unto the Scythians, and other irreligious and lawless nations, who dedicate no images to their gods, and count them fools that do so." And a third time, "thou laughest at our images."‡ "For this cause you lay great impiety to our charge," saith Arnobius, "because we make no images, or shape of any of the gods." In a word, when Adrian the Emperor had commanded that§ "temples should be made in all cities without images, it was by them conjectured that he made them for Christ," saith Lampridius; who adds, that "he was forbidden to proceed in this enterprise, by those who, consulting the oracles, found that all men would turn Christians, if this, according to their wishes, should fall out." Whence evident it is, that it was not the use of Christians then to have images in churches, but that the contrary was according to their wishes.

6thly. If we consider what the Fathers answered to this accusation of the heathens, we shall more fully be convinced, that they did not venerate, but did entirely reject the use of images, as vain, ridiculous, and inconsistent with the Christian faith, and the true worship of a Deity. For,

Whereas the heathens complained that Christians laughed at their images, Origen replies|| "that they did not laugh at the insensate statues, but at those who worshipped them." And he justifies this practice of the Christians by saying, that¶ "any man of sound reason could not but laugh at them who looked upon images, and by the contemplation of them,

* Ἡμᾶς ἀγάλματα ἰδρῦσθαι φεύγειν. L. 8. p. 389, 404. [ut supra, p. 755, 772.]

† Οὐκ ἀνίσχονται ἀγάλματα, οὐδὲ γὰρ σέβειν τοῦτο. L. 7. p. 373. [Ibid. p. 738.]

‡ Quod non Deorum alicujus simulacrum constituamus aut formam. L. 6. p. 189.

§ Christo Templum facere voluit (Severus) quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui Tempia in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris jusserat fieri. Hist. August. c. 43. Qui consulentes sacra, repperunt omnes Christianos fieri, si id optato evenisset. Ibid.

|| Οὐδὲ καταγελῶμεν τῶν ἀψύχων ξράνων, ἀλλ' εἰ ἄρα τῶν προσκυνοῦντων αὐτοῖς. L. 8. p. 404. [Ibid. p. 772.]

¶ Τίς γὰρ νοῦν ἔχων οὐ καταγέλασται τοῦ ἐφορῶντος τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν, &c. l. 7. p. 362. [Ibid. p. 726.]

thought to ascend from what was seen, and was a symbol, to what was understood.

2ndly. They answer, by distinguishing betwixt such images as were the work of an artificer, saying, that these they did reject; and such as were spiritual, consisting in the resemblance of the virtues and perfections of their Lord; and these they owned as acceptable to God, and such as they regarded. "The images which are agreeable to God,"* saith Origen, "are not such as are framed by servile artists, but those virtues which are formed in us by the word of God, and are the imitations of the first-born of the creation, in whom are the examples of justice, temperance, fortitude, prudence, and godliness, and all other virtues.† In all therefore who are furnished with these virtues, are the images which we think it meet to honour, the prototype of all images, the image of the invisible God, his only Son; and‡ they who put off the old man with his works, and put on the new, which is renewed in knowledge according to the image of him that created him, by receiving this image of their Creator, make such images in themselves as God regards," insinuating, that God liked no other.§ "In sum," saith he, "all Christians do attempt to make such images, as we have now related, not such as have no life or sense, nor such in which wicked demons may reside;" that is, neither such images as were in use amongst the heathens, nor such as are now used by the Church of Rome; for theirs, I suppose, have neither life nor sense:|| "Let therefore any man that will," saith he, "compare the images I have now mentioned, framed in the souls of pious persons, with the images of Phidias, and Polycletus, and the like, and he will manifestly discern that the latter are void of life, and corrupted by time;" and therefore he concludes, that there is no compare betwixt the images of Christians, and of heathens. So that the images which are obnoxious to the injuries of

* 'Αγάλματα δὲ πρέποντα Θεῷ, οὐχ ὑπὸ βαναύσων τεχνιτῶν κατεσκευασμένα, &c. L. 8. p. 389. [Ibid. p. 755.]

† 'Εν πᾶσιν οὖν ἐστὶν ἀγάλματα οἷς πρέπον εἶναι πεπείσμεθα τιμᾶσαι τὸ πρωτότυπον πάντων ἀγαλμάτων. Ibid.

‡ 'Αγάλματα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ποιοῦσιν ὅποια βούλεται ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεός. Ibid.

§ Οὐκ ἄψυχα καὶ ἀναισθητα, οὐδὲ δαιμόνων δεκτικά. [Ibid. p. 756.]

|| 'Εκεῖνα μὲν καὶ ἄψυχα εἶναι καὶ χρόνῳ φθειρόμενα· ταῦτα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀθανάτῳ μένειν ψυχῇ.—οὐδεμία σύγκρισις ἐστὶν τῶν παρ' ἡμὶ πρὸς τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν ἑθνῶν. Ibid. p. 390, 391. [Ibid. 756, 757.]

time, and which are void of life and sense, were then accounted heathen images, the images of Christians were then only those which are framed in the immortal souls of men. According to that of Theodotus Ancyranus,* “We have no tradition to form the images of saints in material colours; but we are taught to express their virtues recorded in the writings concerning them, as their living images.” And that of Amphilochius,† “We are not concerned to frame the fleshy persons of the saints by colours upon tables, but to imitate the virtues of their conversations.”

3. To the comparison made by Celsus betwixt them and the Scythians, Moors, and Persians, in this matter, Origen replies,‡ that “it is true, both they and Christians were averse from images; but then the Christians rejected them on better grounds than heathens did, *viz.* because they would not violate the commandment forbidding the use of them, and because they dreaded to debase the divine worship, by bringing it down to matter shaped in such a manner and figure. And because,§ finding by the doctrine of Christ the way of piety towards God, they avoided those things, which, by appearance of piety, made men wicked.” Which passages assure us, not only that the Christians of those times abstained from all religious use of images, but also that they did it in obedience to the doctrine of Christ, and the commandment forbidding it, *i.e.* upon the very motive that moves us to do so.

4thly. Arnobius in answer to the same objection of the heathens, that Christians did contemn the deities, because they had “no images of any of them, nor did they worship their effigies;” whereas “the heathens made, and with religious observation did regard them,”|| gives this reason why the Christians had them not, *viz.* “Because (saith he), we do conceive, that if they certainly be gods whom we worship, and have that eminence which by that name is signified, they will

* Ἀλλὰ τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς οἷόν τινας ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας ἀναμάτ-
τεσθαι δευδῶμεθα. Apud Conc. Nic. 2. Conq. tom. 7. p. 492.

† Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων διὰ χρωμάτων
ἐπίμελες ἡμῖν ἐντυποῦν. Ibid. p. 484.

‡ Κατάγειν τὴν περὶ τὸ θεῖον θρησκείαν ἐπὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ὕλην
οὕτως ἐσχηματισμένην. L. 4. p. 374. [ut supra, p. 739.]

§ Εὐρόντες ὅτι διὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίαν τὸν τρόπον τῆς εἰς
τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας φεύγομεν τὰ φαντασίᾳ εὐσεβείας ἀσεβεῖς ποιοῦντα.
L. 8. p. 391. [Ibid. p. 758.]

|| Sequitur ut de simulacris dicamus, quæ multa arte componitis, et re-
ligiosa observatione curatis. L. 6. p. 194.

deride, or be offended with such kind of honour.”* 2ndly. He tells them, that he is not able to determine, “whether they themselves do this seriously, or with intention to deride what they pretend to worship:† for if it be certain,” saith he, “they are gods whom you worship, and that they have their habitations in the highest heavens, what reason can induce you to frame these images of them?”‡ Which reason doth as much concern the Roman images, for they are images of Christ, the Virgin Mother, and of those saints and martyrs, whom they suppose to live in heaven. 3rdly. He calls upon the heathens to clear up their understandings, and consider, that “those images before which they lie prostrate, and which they humbly adore, are wood, stones, brass, silver, or gold,”§ and such are also all the images of Roman Catholics. And having urged these, and many other arguments, he concludes, “he had sufficiently demonstrated how vainly images were made.”|| Whence evident it is, that Christians then esteemed it a vain, ridiculous thing, and a dishonour to that Jesus whom they owned as God, to worship him by images, and that they had no image of any thing in heaven. And indeed, the very silence of the Christians, as to the matter of images, when they professedly reply to this impeachment of the heathens, is a sufficient argument that they allowed no use of images in their religious worship, and that they paid no veneration to them: for should any heathen now object against the Church of Rome, that “they had no images; would they not answer, they had the images of Christ, his Virgin Mother, and of his blessed saints and martyrs?” This therefore should in honesty and reason have been the answer of the ancient Christians to the like objection of the heathens made against them, had it been suitable to the received principles and practice of their times.

Moreover, the heathens, as Lactantius informs us, thought an image so very requisite to the performance of religious

* *Honorum hæc genera aut risui habere, si rideant, aut indigne perpeti* P. 189.

† *Utrumne istud serio et cum proposito faciatis gravi, an ridendo res ipsas?* Ibid. p. 194.

‡ *Si enim certum est apud vos Deos esse quos veneramini, atque in summis cœli regionibus degere, quæ ratio est, ut simulacra ista fingantur a vobis?* P. 195.

§ *Simulacra ista, quæ templis in omnibus prostrati, et humiles adoratis, ossa, lapides, æra sunt, &c.* P. 200.

|| *Satis demonstratum est quam inaniter fiant simulacra,* p. 210.

worship, that "they imagined there could be no religion where there was no image."* And this induced them to conceive, that albeit they knew not of any images the Christians used, yet had they some concealed amongst them. And hence Cæcilius asked the Christians, "Why is it that you hide and conceal the thing you worship, be it what you will; why have you no altars, no temples, no known images?"† not doubting but they had some images concealed. To this imagination of the heathens, Origen thus replies: "We openly declare the venerable principles of our religion, and do not hide them as Celsus doth imagine; for we teach our converts the contempt of idols and of all images."‡ Octavius, also, takes notice of it in these words: "You think we hide what we worship, if we have not temples with images and altars."§ And then he answers in behalf of Christians, with a free insinuation, that they had no such things; and gives these reasons why they had them not: "What image shall I make of God, since if you rightly do esteem it, man is the image of his Maker? What temple shall I build, when the whole world cannot contain him? What sacrifices should I offer, since a good soul and pure mind is the offering that he will accept? These (and not temples, images, or victims) are the holy services which we present unto our God."|| Whence it is evident, that images were not admitted then amongst the *sacra* of the Christians; and that they held it not convenient to make an image of that Jesus whom they asserted to be God.

Now briefly to reflect upon these things: can it be reasonably imagined, that they who so expressly tell us, "They had no tradition to make the images of saints, no sensible image, no images of their bodies," and that "they knew no vain figures of images;" that they who declare that they themselves despised, and "taught their converts the contempt of images;" that their religion and their Saviour taught them not to be solicitous about them, but to relinquish, abstain from, and to abandon them; that they who teach that it was proper to the

* Nec ullam religionem putant, ubicunque illa non fulserint. L. 2. c. 6. [c. 7.] p. 169. Ed. Lyd. [vol. 1. p. 100. Wirceburg. 1783.]

† Cur occultare quicquid illud colunt magnopere nituntur? cur nullas aras habent, templa nulla, nulla nota simulacra? P. 10.

‡ L. 3. p. 120. [vol. 1. p. 456. Paris. 1733.]

§ Putatis nos occultare quod colimus, si delubra et aras non habemus, — quod enim simulacrum Deo fingam, cum, si recte existimes, sit Dei homo simulacrum? P. 36.

|| Hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei Sacra sunt. Ibid.

heathens to honour images and pictures ; that the custom was heathenish and idolatrous, and only fit for demons ; and that Christians were to be known by this, that “ they would not adore the works of men’s hands ;” that “ they had left all images and statues, and that this was their wisdom ;” that they to whom it was continually objected by the heathens, that “ they neither had, nor would endure images ;” that they “ avoided the making statues, and laughed at them who did it :” and who, in answer to these things, not only do confess the thing, but justify and glory in it ; telling their adversaries, that images were vainly made by him, who was the image of his Maker, and should make no other images ; that “ they deservedly laughed at them ;” and that the heavenly powers themselves, if they were subject to that passion, would laugh at such votaries ; I say, can it be reasonably conceived, that they who say such things, should make it a matter of their faith, that images should be worshipped, and in their constant practice should adore the images of Christ, and of his saints ?

§. 6. Nor do the Fathers only declare, in their Apologies and conflicts with the heathens, they had no images ; but they commend themselves and others upon this account, and say, it was a thing to be commended, both in them and others. And,

On this account they mightily commend the Jewish polity, because it taught them not only to transcend all images, but all created beings, and to ascend to the Creator of the world, saying, that “ he that doth inspect their laws and constitutions, will find that they were men who had a shadow of the heavenly life on earth, because they had no image makers in their commonwealth.”*

As for themselves, they declared, that they, on this account, “ were men, or something more excellent than men, because they did not venerate, but did transcend all images, and go immediately to God.”† And “ if we do not worship statues, and cold images, like to those dead men which they represent, do we not deserve praise rather than punishment,”‡ saith

* Ὑπερβᾶν οὐ μόνον ἀγάλματα. Orig. adv. Celsum, l. 2. p. 91. [ut supra, p. 426.] Οὐδεὶς τῶν εἰκόνας ποιούντων. L. 4. p. 181. [Ibid. p. 524.]

† Ἀνθρώποι δὲ, καὶ εἰ τι ἀνθρώπων τιμώτερον. L. 4. p. 177. [Ibid. p. 519.]

‡ Nonne ^{laudem} magis quam poenam merebatur repudium agniti erroris ? Apol. cap. 12. [p. 13. Par. 1695.]

Tertullian, "for the refusal of this ancient error?" Yea, they declare their humble confidence, that "God would not overlook them, but vouchsafe them some manifestation of his goodness, and give them some fruit of his providence, amongst other reasons, for this very cause, because they, despising images of human art, endeavoured directly by reason to ascend to God."*

And lastly, as for those heathens, who for some time worshipped the Deity without images, they say, they served God "more purely when they had no images; and that their religion would have been better had they done so still."† But as for those who retained them, and looked upon them when they worshipped, or did esteem them sacred, they declared they could not but look upon them "as men of a lame and infirm mind," they could not "but laugh at their folly."‡ And they do frequently apply that passage of the Psalmist to them, "They that make them are like unto them;"§ as judging it the extremity of error in them who had the use of reason, to worship stocks and stones. Now, sure we cannot reasonably think these Fathers practised themselves what they thus laughed at, and condemned in others: that they admired the Jewish polity, because it did permit no images in their sacred worship, and yet conceived these things not only consistent with, but even an advantage to the Christian polity; or that, at the same time, they could conceive themselves praiseworthy for rejecting, and even despising images of human art; and yet not only have them, but think them worthy of their veneration, and by them should ascend unto that Jesus whom they owned as their God: we therefore may be well assured from these sayings, that the Christians of those times did not look upon images when they performed their worship to God the Father, or his Son Christ Jesus. And to assure us yet further that they did not do it, they inform us, that when they paid their worship to the due object of it, they did "shut their

* *Μὴ ὑπερεωρᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ αὐτοῖς τινα ἐπιφάνειαν γεγόνειναι.* L. 8. p. 412. [Ibid. p. 781.] *Καὶ τούτοις ἀπονέμει καρπὸν τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτοῦ.* Ibid.

† *Dicit antiquos Romanos plusquam annos 150, Deos sine simulacro coluisse, quod si adhuc remansisset, castius Dii observarentur.* Aug. de C. D. l. 4. c. 13. [c. 31.] [vol. 7. p. 111. Par. 1685.] Agob. de Imag. sect. 24. [ut supra, p. 256.]

‡ *Orig. l. 7. p. 362, 367.* [ut supra, p. 726, 731.]

§ *August. et Theodoret. in Psal. cxiii.* [Aug. Opp. vol. 4. p. 1263. Par. 1681.] [Theodoret. Opp. vol. 1. p. 1414. Hal. 1769.]

eyes," and thought it was their duty so to do, and that this practice did enable them the better to lift up their minds to God.

Origen, in allusion to those words of Christ; "I am come into the world, that they who see not, may see; and they who see, may be made blind," saith, that* "the Word makes the eyes of the soul to see, but blinds those of the senses, that the soul may without distraction behold what it ought: if therefore any man act after the manner of Christians, the eye of his soul is opened, but that of his sense is shut; and by how much more he openeth his better eye, and shuts the eyes of his senses, by so much more he seeth, and contemplates better God, and his Son, who is the Word and wisdom." And again,† "even the meanest Christian shutting the eyes of his sense, and opening those of his soul, transcends all the whole world, and shames the wise men of the world, who, ἐνορῶντες τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, looking upon images by contemplation of them, do endeavour to erect their minds to God." St. Basil‡ saith thus, "I do not confess with my lips, that I may appear to many so to do, but, shutting my eyes inwardly in my heart, I shew my inward groanings to him that seeth in secret." They, therefore, doubtless thought not images then needful to excite devotion, or to move compunction in them, though by the second Nicene Council they were afterwards declared useful to these ends.§

§. 7. And therefore whereas heathens had many of the same pretences for having and for using images in their solemn worship, which that Nicene Council, and the Church of Rome, have since took up, the sayings of the Fathers equally confute them both. For,

1. Whereas the Trent Catechism saith, that the having images in churches, and the giving worship and respect unto them, tends, *maximo fidelium bono*,|| "to the great benefit of the faithful." And the second Nicene Council doth frequently in effect declare the same. Theodotus smartly puts this question to those who used them in his time: "let them say, who do erect such forms, what profit can redound unto

* Παντὸς οὖν τοῦ κατὰ τρόπον χριστιανίζοντος ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐγγήγερο ὁφθαλμός, καὶ ὁ τῆς αἰσθήσεως μέμνηκε. L. 7. p. 358. [Ibid. p. 722.]

† Χριστιανὸς δὲ καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης—μύσας τοὺς τῆς αἰσθήσεως ὁφθαλμοὺς—ὑπεραναβαίνει τὸν ὅλον κόσμον. P. 362. [Ibid. p. 726.]

‡ Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ καρδίᾳ ὄμμα μύων. In Psalm 37. tom. 1. p. 208. [vol. 1. p. 520. Par. 1839.] § Act. 2. [ut supra,] p. 103.

|| Part 3. cap. 2. sect. 24. [p. 307. Lips. 1843.]

them by so doing? or to what spiritual contemplation are they led by that remembrance?"* Clemens of Alexandria† expressly saith, that they are ἀργὰ καὶ βέβηλα, "vain and profane." Lactantius,‡ that they are, *insensibilia et vana*, "vain and insensate things." Origen and St. Austin, that they were "dangerous and hurtful to the Christians, and for that cause avoided by them."

2. Whereas the heathens said, that they used their images§ "only to represent things invisible, by what was visible; and to teach them, as it were, to read the things concerning the gods out of these image-books;" that these things were as letters which did instruct them in the knowledge of God, and by inspection of which they attained unto it: that the Divinity was to be propounded to the mind, and these things only to be used, εἰς μνήμην τοῦ Θεοῦ,|| "to bring God to their remembrance, καὶ ὥσπερ χειραγωγίαν τινὰ καὶ ὁδὸν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, and, as it were, a manuduction, or way to bring them to their minds." That they were but¶ "as glasses, whereby to represent God to them; and they ought to be approved, οὐ ταῦτα τιμῶντες, ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτων τὸ θεῖον, who do not worship them, but by them the Godhead." The Fathers having mentioned these notions of the heathen wisdom, say, that nothing can be more ridiculous, and greater matter of their shame; and that they are more like to** "writers of fables, than divines; that God was not honoured by such symbols; that they who know the truth, ought not to think to honour the divine virtues by images made of insensate matter, but they should openly teach all, not to admire things obvious to sense, but only the invisible Maker of them, and worship his invisible and incorporeal virtues, not thinking to honour the Divinity with insensate statues, which can have nothing well-pleasing to God, nor the images of divine powers, but with sound doctrine, and a pure

* Εἰπάτωσαν οἱ τὰς τοιαύτας δὲ ἀναστυλόντες μορφὰς, ποίας ἐκ τούτων ἄρα καταπολαύοιεν ὠφελείας, ἣ ἐν ποίᾳ διὰ τῆς τούτων ἀναμνήσεως ἀνάγονται πνευματικῇ θεωρίᾳ. Conc. Nic. [Ibid.] p. 492.

† Strom. 7. p. 714. [ut supra, p. 845.] ‡ L. 2. sect. 5. p. 161.

§ Τὰ περὶ θεῶν γράμματα καθάπερ ἐκ βιβλῶν τῶν ἀγαλματικῶν. Pophyr. apud Euseb. Præpar. Evang. l. 3. c. 7.

|| Max. Tyr. Dissert. 38. p. 370, 377.

¶ Plutarch de Iside et Osir. p. 382.

** Ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἐκείνοι μυθολογοῦσιν, οὐ γὰρ θεολογοῦσιν. Athanas. contr. Gent. p. 21, 23. [vol. 1. p. 17, 19. Heidelb. 1601]. Euseb. Præpar. Evang. l. 3. c. 13. [p. 121. Colon. 1688.] l. 5. c. 14. [Ibid. p. 203.]

mind." By all which sayings, they equally condemn the symbolical images of the sacred Trinity and God the Father, tacitly allowed by the Trent Council* in these words, "(when it is expedient for the unlearned, in figures, to express the histories and narratives of holy Scripture, they must be taught, that the Divinity is not therefore pictured, as if it could be seen by a corporeal eye, or expressed by colours, or by figures;)" and received generally in all Roman Churches.†

And, 2ndly, whereas the‡ Nicene Council, and the Roman Church have introduced images of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the saints, under the same pretence; as tending, 1st, to instruction, *viz.* "the images of Christ being framed," say they, "that his incarnation may be made known to all; and the images of the Apostles, prophets, and martyrs, to be a short writing, and excitation, and teaching of the people, especially the most simple." And, 2ndly, for the "remembrance of the prototypes." I say, whereas these are the Romish and the Nicene pleas, the Fathers do expressly say, § "They cared not to make any such images of saints, because they had no need of them;" || they knew not "to what spiritual contemplation they could be erected by such remembrance of them:" they had the writings of the saints, which were their living images, and with them were content. St. Austin, speaking of some who said, that "our Lord Christ had written books of magic, and committed them to St. Peter and Paul;" he conjectures, that they therefore made mention¶ "of these two Apostles, because they had in many places, particularly at Rome, seen those two pictured with him." And then he adds,** "so verily deserve they to err, who sought Christ and his Apostles, not in the holy Bibles, but on painted walls;" an

* *Doceatur populus non propterea divinitatem figurari, quasi corporeis oculis conspici, aut coloribus vel figuris exprimi possit.* Sess. 25. [ut supra, vol. 14. p. 896.] Jam enim receptæ sunt fere ubique.

† *Bell. de Rel. Sanct.* l. 2. c. 8. [vol. 2. p. 437. Prag. 1721.]

‡ *Ἵνα γνωρίζηται πᾶσιν ἡ ἐνσαρκος αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία.—εἰς σύντομον γραφὴν καὶ διέγερσιν, καὶ διδασκαλίαν τῶν λαῶν, μάλιστα τῶν ἀπλουστέρων.* Act. 1. [ut supra, vol. 7.] p. 60.

§ *Ὅτι οὐ χρῄζομεν αὐτῶν.* Amphil. apud 2 Nic. Concil. Act. 6. [Ibid.] p. 484.

|| *Διὰ τῆς τούτων ἀναμνήσεως.* Theodot. ibid. p. 482.

¶ *Credo quod pluribus locis simul cum illo pictos viderunt.*

** Sic omnino errare meruerunt, qui Christum et Apostolos ejus non in sanctis codicibus, sed in pictis parietibus quæsierint. De Cons. Evang. L. 1. c. 10. [vol. 3. par. 2. p. 8. Par. 1680.]

expression which deserves to be considered by them, who have taken from them those books in which St. Austin judged it fit to seek Christ and his Apostles, and substituted in their room these wall lectures; which, it is evident, he approved not of: and much less the Council of Frankfort, witness these words: "What madness is it to say, that by a painted image we may come to the memory of Christ's presence on earth! Oh unhappy memory! which, that it may remember Christ, who never should recede out of the mind of a good man, needs the beholding of an image."*

3. The heathens say, that by beholding of their images and statues, they ascended to the prototype; and that their images were invented for this end; confessing, that if any one was able straight to erect his soul to heaven, and go directly to God, τοῦδεν ἴσως δεῖ τούτοις ἡγαλμάτων, such in likelihood, could need no images. The second† Nicene Council in a like manner saith, "that they worship the images of Christ, his blessed Mother, and the saints; that by their pictures they may be able to ascend by memory, unto the prototype. And because the more they view their images, the better are they excited to the remembrance and desire of the prototype, and to give honorary worship to the images." Now this, as you have heard, the Fathers have declared to be the very thing for which they laughed at the philosophers, that by looking upon images and symbols, they thought to ascend to what was understood and represented by them; declaring, that Christianity taught them to overlook these things, and to ascend immediately to God, and to his Son; and that the rudest Christian did so, by shutting of his bodily eyes, and not by looking upon what was sensible. Accordingly the § Council of Frankfort teacheth, that "to contemplate Christ, who is the virtue and wisdom of God; or to behold the virtues, which by God were derived upon his saints, they needed not that corporeal sight which was common to them with unreasonable creatures, but the spiritual only."

* Quæ vesania est dicere, per imaginem ad memoriam veniimus de ejus in terra præsentia. Lib. Carol. l. 4. c. 2. [ut supra, p. 489.]

† Max. Tyr. Dissert. 38. p. 369.

‡ Ὡς διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀναζωγραφίσεως εἰς ὑπόμνησιν καὶ μνήμην ἀνάγεσθαι δύνασθαι πρὸς τὸ πρωτότυπον. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 320. Διανίστανται πρὸς τὴν τῶν πρωτοτύπων μνήμην καὶ ἐπιπόθησιν. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 556

§ Non corporeus nobis visus, sed spiritualis est necessarius. Lib. Carol. l. 2. c. 21. [c. 22.] [Ibid. p. 219.]

4thly. The Fathers of the second Nicene Council do not only style these images sacred and holy, but declare, "they salute them in hope of being made partakers of sanctification by them:" asserting, that by paying honorary worship to them, they expect, **ἐν μεθεξεί γίνεσθαι τινος ἁγιασμοῦ*, to be made partakers of some holiness; and that they really do, *μεταλαμβάνειν ἁγιασμοῦ*, derive some holiness from the action. And doubtless the heathens had the same conceit, as is evident from the frequent assertions of the Fathers against them, and consequently against the second Nicene Council, "that there could be nothing sacred, nothing holy in an image, or any thing made by an artificer." Accordingly the †Council of Frankfort saith, "they ought not to be called holy:" and the Synod held at‡ Paris, saith, "the second Nicene Council erred not a little, not only in saying, that images were to be adored, but also in calling them holy; and saying that holiness might be had by them."

Now can it be rationally supposed, that they who thus declared, "that images were needless; that they know no advantage could be received by them; that all men were to be taught not to admire them; that they deserved to err, who sought instruction from them; that as for Christians, even the rudest of them rather chose to shut their eyes, when they performed their devotion, than to employ them about sensible objects;" with many other things of a like nature: can it, I say, be well imagined, that these very men should judge these very images fit to instruct, to sanctify, to work compunction in them; yea, to be the objects worthy of their veneration?

§. 8. Once more, the Fathers represent this as a practice proper to the vilest heretics: for of the Carpocratian and Gnostic heretics, it is related by Epiphanius,§ that "they had many images, some painted, others framed in gold and silver, and other matter; which they said, were the representations of Christ made under Pontius Pilate. Carpocratians, saith||

* Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 265, 321, 453, 492.

† Nec sanctæ dici debent. L. 3. c. 2. [Ibid. p. 298.]

‡ Qui—Sanctas nuncupari sanxerunt, et sanctimoniam ab eis se adipisci posse professi sunt. P. 20. [ut supra, p. 2.]

§|| Imagines quasdam depictas, quasdam de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicentes, formam Christi factam a Pilato, et has coronant, et reliquam observationem circa eas similiter ut Gentes faciunt. Epiph. Hær. 7. [Hær. 17.] p. 108. [Colon. 1682.] Iren. l. 1. c. 24. [p. 2. c. 25. p. 105. Venet. 1734.]

Irenæus, have some painted images, some also made of other matter; saying, that their images of Christ were made by Pilate: and these they crown and place with the images of Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras, and perform other rites unto them, as the Gentiles do; that is they censed and worshipped them," say * Epiphanius and † St. Austin. Thus of Marcellina, a Carpocratian heretic, it is related by Epiphanius and St. Austin, "that she made the image of Christ, and Paul, and Homer, and Pythagoras, and did cense, worship, or bow down to them." Besides St. Austin doth affirm of Carpocrates, "that he† was reputed to have held, that Christ was only man, and so could not intend to give him the worship due to God." And Bellarmine himself confesseth, that§ "without doubt, they, of whom Irenæus speaks, did worship the image for the relation which it bore to Christ." And thus the doctors of the Church of Rome allow it worthy of worship, and so must be condemned by Irenæus as much as are the Carpocratians. Here then is undeniable conviction, that what the second Nicene Council have decreed to be the worship due unto the images of Christ, and all the blessed spirits; and what the Church of Rome doth daily practise, was deemed, in the purer ages of the Church, a practice proper to the vilest heretics. "They have these images," say the Fathers; "they offer incense, and bow down to them; and in this they do like heathens, and therefore not like Christians:" therefore the Christians of those ages did not so; for what is more absurd, than to reprove these heretics for doing that which the best of Christians daily practised?

CHAP. II.

The Arguments of the Fathers against the worship of heathen images conclude equally against those now used by Christians, as, v. g. 1st, That it was incongruous to worship or bow

* Εἰκόνας δὲ ποιήσας ἐν κρυφῇ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ Παύλου καὶ Ὁμήρου—ταύτας ἱδρυμία, καὶ προσεκύνει. Anaceph. p. 140.

† Colebat imagines adorando incensumque ponendo. August. Hær. 7. [vol. 8. p. 7. Par. 1688.]

‡ Hic Jesum hominem tantummodo putasse perhibetur. Ibid.

§ Isti cum Christum colerent, proculdubio imaginem ejus propter ipsum colebant. De imagine Sanctorum, c. 24. Sect. sexta ratio. [vol. 2. p. 461. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

down to them, because they were made of earth, insensate earth, the same with that of which vessels were made for common uses, and they were sensual objects, and therefore were not to be adored, but trod upon and contemned, and cast away, § 1. 2ndly, Because they were worse than beasts, imperfect insects, and dead things, which yet it would be a vile and unbecoming thing for men to bow down to, § 2. 3rdly, Because the artificer who made them was better, whom yet it was shameful to adore : that being the works of men's hands they could not be holy, valuable, acceptable to God, and so not fit to be adored ; that the works of God were not to be adored in honour of him, much less the works of men's hands in honour of the saints, § 3. 4thly, That man, who was the image of God, and was made upright, was not to adore the images of men, or venerate earthly things, § 4. 5thly, Because if what they worshipped were heavenly powers, they would laugh at, or be angry with such worshippers, if they were in heaven ; it were better, neglecting images, to look up thither ; that if images were made for the commemoration of the dead, or of the absent, they were not to be worshipped, § 5. 6thly, Because images were dangerous, as tending to debase the soul, and render the Divine Majesty contemptible, § 6. 7thly, Because they were the invention of the devil, § 7. That the Fathers could not have spoken these things, which equally conclude against all image-worship, if they themselves had worshipped images, § 8. That had this been their practice, the heathens must have then retorted these things, as afterwards they did, § 9. That many of these sayings of the Fathers are expressly condemned in the second Nicene Council, § 10. That the Church of Rome hath prosecuted many for saying the same things, and forced them to renounce them as great heresies, § 11.

THIS will be farther evident if we consider the objections which the holy Fathers make against that worship of images which had obtained in the heathen world : for they produce such arguments against it as equally destroy all image-worship, whatsoever be the object represented by the image ; and do as fully prove it is unlawful to worship images of Christ and of departed saints, as to adore the images of heathen deities : so that it must be granted, that either in their days Christians did neither bow to nor prostrate themselves before the images

of Christ, the blessed Virgin, or the saints departed; or that they practised that which they themselves most vehemently reprov'd in the heathens. Now these arguments of the Fathers are taken, 1. From the consideration of images themselves: and here they argue,

§. 1. 1st, From the matter of them, thus, that "the materials of carved images were only polished earth, which Christians were taught to tread upon and to contemn, and therefore could not, without wickedness, adore what they did trample under feet; and that to humble themselves to what was, as to matter, earth, was to humble themselves to hell, and to condemn themselves to death. That they who adore them consider not that they daily burn and tread upon the like matter; that they are made of the same matter with our common, and perhaps impurer vessels: that there can be no religion where there is an image, because religion consists in things divine and heavenly, whereas there can be nothing heavenly which consists of earth. That certainly he doth not in his mind contemplate God, who giveth veneration to an image."*

That "this matter is insensate, and that it is a certain maxim among Christians, ἀναίσθητον ὕλην μὴ σέβειν, that they are not to worship that which hath no sense. That it is great folly to adore what is void of sense, when every one that hath sense, knows those things are not to be worshipped which are made by God and have sense. That they are fools, and

* Χρυσός ἐστι τὸ ἀγαλμά σου, γῆ ἐστίν, γῆν δὲ ἐγὼ πατεῖν οὐ προσκυνεῖν μεμελέτηκα. Clem. Alex. protrept. p. 38. [p. 50. Venet. 1757.] De simulacris ipsis nihil aliud deprehendo quam materias sorores esse vasculorum instrumentorumque communium. Tertul. Apol. c. 12. [p. 13. Par. 1695.] Προσκυνούντες λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις οὐχ ὀρώσιν ὅτι τὰ μὲν ὅμοια τοῖς ποσὶ πατοῦσι καὶ καίουσιν. Athanas. contr. Gentes, p. 15. [ut supra, p. 12.] Quis autem non intelligat nefas esse rectum animal curvari ut adoret terram, quæ idcirco pedibus nostris subjecta est, ut calcanda nobis non adoranda sit, Lact. 1. 2. c. 17. [18.] p. 228. [vol. 1. p. 137. Wirceb. 1783.] Non est dubium quin Religio nulla sit ubicunque simulacrum est—Quia nihil potest esse coeleste in ea re quæ sit ex terra. Ibid. c. 18. [19.] p. 229. [Ibid. 139.] Deum, cujus sedes illa est, quem oculis non possumus, animo contemplerur, quod profecto non facit qui æs, aut lapidem, quæ sunt terrena, veneratur, Ibid. cap. 1. p. 140. [Ibid. p. 80.] Stultissimi sunt qui non intelligunt esse mortiferum, relicto Deo vivo, prosternere se, atque adorare terrena, qui nesciunt, et illos æternam pœnam manere, qui figmenta insensibilia fuerint venerati, Epit. c. 1. p. 736. Cum vos terræ submittitis humilioresque facitis, ipsi vos ultro ad Inferos mergitis, ad mortemque damnatis. Lact. 1. 2. c. 2. p. 148. [Ibid. vol. 1. p. 84.]

blind, who know not that they shall everlastingly perish, who worship figments void of sense.”*

That “nothing is to be worshipped, but wholly to be cast away, which is the object of our senses, and is seen with mortal eyes ; and that our Saviour came to free God’s worship from these sensual objects.”†

§. 2. 2ndly, Comparing these insensate images with other things, to wit, with beasts and with dead things, they discourse thus :

That “if it be a most vile and unbecoming thing for men to worship and bow down to beasts, it is more shameful for them to worship and bow down to images, they being more dishonourable than any living creature : a mouse, a worm, a mole, a serpent being much better than an image, because they have sense, which images have not ; the birds of the air being more honourable, because they have life and motion, which images have not ; they can frame voices with their throats, which images cannot ; they judge images to be things void of sense, and therefore nest, and make their habitations in them, and even mute upon them. That they are worse than any dead thing, for that once lived ; whereas images never did enjoy one moment of life.”‡

§. 3. 3rdly, From the consideration of the artificer, or the efficient cause of images, they argue thus :

That the “artificer who made these images must be esteemed

* Tu ergo adoras insensilem, cum unusquisque habens sensum, nec ea quidem credat adoranda quæ a Deo facta sunt, et habent sensum. Clemens Recogn. l. 5. sect. 16. [vol. 1. p. 137. Lips. 1838.]

† Nec ponderare secum unamquamque rem potest vulgus indoctum, ut intelligat nihil colendum esse quod oculis mortalibus cernitur, Lact. l. 2. c. 3. p. 149. [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 85.] Origen. l. 7. p. 362. [ut supra, p. 726.] supra August. contra Acad. l. 1. c. 1.

‡ Τα δὲ καὶ παντός ἐστιν ἀτιμότερα ζῶον τὰ ἀγάλματα—εἰ γὰρ καὶ τινὰ τῶν ζῶων οὐχὶ πάσας ἔχει τὰς αἰσθήσεις ὥσπερ εἶλαι καὶ κάμπαι.—Ἀλλὰ γε ἀμείνους εἰσὶ τῶν ζοάνων τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τέλειον ὄντων κωφῶν, ἔχουσι γὰρ αἰσθησιν μίαν, τὰ δὲ οὐδὲ μίας αἰσθήσεως μετέχει τὰ ἀγάλματα. Clem. Alex. protrept. p. 33, 34. [ut supra, p. 45.] Πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἂν τις οἰκτειρήσει αὐτοὺς, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι βλέποντες αὐτοὶ τοῖς μὴ βλέπουσι προσκυνοῦσι. Athanas. contr. Gent. p. 15. [ut supra, p. 12.] Melior est enim bestia, ut si pudeat adorare bestiam, quam fecit Deus videntem, audientem, etc. viderent quam pudendum esset adorare malum et carens vita sensuque simulacrum, August. in Ps. 113. [vol. 4. p. 1260. Par. 1681.] vid. Tertul. Apol. l. 12. [ut supra, p. 13.] Minucium, p. 26. Arnob. l. 6. p. 202. Theodoret. in Ps. 113. [vol. 1. p. 1414. Hal. 1769.] Clem. Rom. recog. l. 5. sect. 16. [ut supra.] Chrysost. in Es. Hom. 2. p. 1037. [vol. 6. p. 28. Par. 1724.]

better than his own handiwork, because he gave unto it that perfection it enjoys ; and it is impossible there should be more perfection in the work than in the artificer ; that therefore it is much more shameful to adore the image which he makes, than to adore the man himself.”*

That “nothing can be sacred which is the work of men’s hands. That the works of servile artists and stone-cutters cannot be sacred. That it is a thing written by God in the hearts of men, that nothing is to be esteemed sacred, or holy, or of much value, which is the work of the mechanic or artificer. That images made by servile men, of earthly matter, must be vain, earthly, and profane.”†

That the “heathens had no just reason to quarrel with the Christians for saying, they were men of a lame and infirm mind who repaired to that which falsely was esteemed sacred as if it truly were so, and who did not see that nothing could be sacred which was the work of servile artists.”‡

That “the curiosity of making statues hath in it nothing acceptable to God. And that the heathens ought not to forbid Christians to assert, that they are blind who think that piety doth appertain to images or statues made out of matter by the art of man.”§ No, it was reserved to a General Council

* *Melior est qui fecit, quam illa quæ facta sunt, et tamen factorem ipsum nemo suspicit aut veretur.* Lact. l. 2. c. 2. p. 146. [ut supra, p. 83.] Πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δίκαιότερον ἦν τὸν τεχνίτην αὐτοὺς προσκυνεῖν ἢ περὶ τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πεποιημένα. Athanas. contr. Gent. p. 15. [ut supra, p. 12.] item. p. 11 et 23. [Ibid. p. 10-18.] August. in Ps. 113. Artifex melior est eis, quia ea potuit membrorum motu atque officio fabricare, quem tamen artificem te utique puderet adorare. P. 1305. [August. Ibid.]

† Τί δ’ ἂν καὶ οἰκοδόμων, καὶ λιθοξόων, καὶ βαναύσου τέχνης ἄγιον εἶη ἔργον· τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βαναύσων κατασκευαζόμενα ἀγάλματα τε καὶ ἱερὰ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τῆς ἀργῆς γίνεται, ὥστε καὶ αὐτὰ ἂν εἶναι ἀργὰ, καὶ ὕλικὰ, καὶ βέβηλα—οὐκέτ’ οὖν ἱερὰ καὶ εἴα τῆς τέχνης τὰ ἔργα. Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. p. 714, 715. [ut supra, p. 845.] Ἱερὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν χρή νομίζειν οὐδὲ πολλοῦ ἄξιον καὶ ἄγιον οἰκοδόμων τε ἔργον καὶ βαναύσων. Orig. contr. Celsum. p. 6, 7. [Ibid. p. 324.]

‡ Μὴ ἀγανακτεῖτω δὲ Κέλσος ἐπ’ αὐτὸν χολοῦς λέγων, καὶ τὰς βάσεις τῆς ψυχῆς πεπηρωμένους, τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα ἱερὰ ὡς ἀληθινὰ ἱερὰ σπεύδοντας, καὶ μὴ ὁρῶντας, ὅτι οὐδὲν βαναύσων ἔργον δύναται εἶναι ἱερόν. Orig. in Celsum, p. 367. [Ibid. p. 731.]

§ “Ὅπερ εἰ ἦν ἐξετασθὲν καὶ γεννημένον Κέλσῳ οὐκ ἀμαθίαν ἡμῖν ἐνεκάλει, οὐδὲ προσέταττε μὴ λέγειν τυφλώττειν τοὺς ἐν ὕλικαῖς τέχναις ἀνθρώπων τῶν κατὰ τὰ ἀγάλματα οἰομένους ἐκδεικνυσθαι τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Orig. ibid. Τί δ’ ἂν ἔχοι θεοφιλεῖς ἢ τῶν ξοάνων ἀνύχων περιμερία; ποίας δ’ εἰκῶν ἐνθεοῦ γίνονται ἂν δυνάμειος ἢ τῶν τοιῶν δὲ σχημάτων μόρφωσις. Euseb. Præpar. Ev. l. 5. c. 14. [p. 203. Colon. 1688.]

of Christian bishops to forbid this, and to style those images, which were the work of the artificer, *ἁγίαί, ἱεραὶ, σεβάσμιαι, προσκυνηταί*, the “holy, sacred, venerable, adorable images,” a thousand times.

That* it was an “impious and foolish custom to adore the works of men’s hands; and that such worship of human works should be no part of the religion of a Christian.”

That it was† “seriously to be thought upon, that if the works of God’s hands were not to be adored and worshipped, no not in honour of that God who made them, much less were the works of men’s hands to be adored in honour of them, whose similitudes they are said to be.”

§. 4. 4thly, From the dignity, the quality, the posture of the persons worshipping, they plead thus, *viz.*

That‡ “man is the image of God, whereas the images of heathen deities and saints are but the images of men: now nothing can be more perverse, or more incongruous, than that the image of a man should be adored by him who is the image of his Maker, because he by so doing worships what is worse and weaker than himself. That if any image was to be adored or worshipped, it should be that of the Creator,§ rather than the creature, *viz.* man, whom God made according to his own image and similitude. That if men were to be adored, it

* *Μὴ δεῖν χειρῶν ἀνθρώποις προσκυνεῖν—φράζομεν.* Justin. M. Dial. 2. p. 66. Vos impii lapides, et signa, et opera manuum hominum adoratis. Tharacus apud Baron. A. D. 290. sect. 5. [p. 256. col. 1. Luc. 1738.] *Λήρον εὐρήσατε τὴν συνήθειαν ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναίσθητα προτρεπόμενοι.* Clem. Alex. protrep. p. 29. [p. 41. Venet. 1757.] Non sit nobis Religio humanorum operum cultus. August. de vera Relig. c. 55. [vol. 1. p. 786. Par. 1679.] vid. Agob. [ut supra,] p. 257.

† Summopere pensandum esse, quia si opera manuum Dei non sunt adoranda et colenda, nec in honorem Dei, quanto magis opera manuum hominum non sunt adoranda et colenda, nec in honorem eorum, quorum similitudines esse dicuntur? Agob. sect. 28. [Ibid.] p. 261. Vid. Clem. R. recogn. l. 5. sect. 16. [ut supra.] Claud. Taurin. Bibl. Patr. tom. 4. 147.

‡ Est autem perversum et incongruens ut simulacrum hominis a simulacro Dei colatur; colit enim quod est deterius et imbecillius. Lact. l. 2. c. 17. [c. 18.] [ut supra, p. 137.]

§ Si ulla imago esset adoranda vel colenda, creatoris potius esset quam creaturæ; nempe hominem fecit Deus ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei — Certe si adorandi fuissent homines, vivi magis quam picti; id est, ubi similitudinem habent Dei, non ubi pecorum; vel, quod verius est, lapidum, sive lignorum, vita, sensu, ratione carentium. Agob. de Imag. sect. 28. [Ibid.] p. 262.

should be rather living men than painted.; that is, when they have the similitude of God, rather than that of stones and wood, void of life, sense, and reason.”

That* “if holiness is to be ascribed not to God only, but to that which is framed in honour of him, it may fitly be applied to the Church, which to the honour of God is made holy by the acknowledgment of him; or to him whom God doth prize and honour, in whom he dwells, in whose just soul we may perceive the divine character and sacred image, and who is an image dedicated to the honour of God; but the word *sacred* is not to be applied to that which is made by servile arts, or is adorned by the hand of a juggler.”

That† “man himself is far more excellent, because he doth what images cannot: and he hath sense, and life, and reason, which they want; and that if images could move, they would rather adore men that made them. That men would think it a reproach and injury to be compared to them, or to be like them in their want of life, and sense, and motion; and that therefore they should blush to worship that which they could not be like or compared to; and they who made and worshipped them, were, as the Psalmist saith, ‘like unto them,’ destitute of manhood, and fallen into such absurdity, that it was just with God to deprive them of sense.”

That‡ “God had made man upright, with a face looking

* Εἰ δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν διχῶς λαμβάνεται ὃ τε Θεὸς αὐτὸς, καὶ τὸ εἰς τιμὴν αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσμα, πῶς οὐ κυρίως τὴν εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατ’ ἐπιγνώσιν ἁγίαν γινομένην ἐκκλησίαν ἱερὸν ἂν εἴποιμεν Θεοῦ τὸ πολλοῦ ἄξιον, καὶ οὐ βαναύσῳ κατασκευασμένον τέχνη, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἀγύρῳ χειρὶ δεδαιδαλμένον. Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. p. 715. [ut supra, p. 846.]

† Melior et tu, quamvis ea non feceris, quoniam quæ illa non possent, facis. August. in Ps. 113. p. 1305. [vol. 4. p. 1260. Par. 1681.] Nec intelligunt homines ineptissimi, quod si sentire simulacra et movere possent, ultro adoratura homines fuissent a quibus sunt expolita. Lact. l. 2. c. 2. p. 146. [ut supra, p. 82.] Velim autem dicerent mihi hi qui idola colunt, si optant similes fieri his quos colunt: vultne aliquis vestrum sic videre quomodo illi vident, &c. quales ergo Dii habendi sunt isti, quorum similitudinem habere contumelia est? Clem. R. Recogn. l. 5. sect. 15. [ut supra, p. 136.]

‡ Quid ante inepta simulacra et figmenta terrena captivum corpus incurvas? . . . ad Cœlum atque ad Deum sursum vultus erectus est, illuc intueri, illuc oculos erige, in supernis Deum quære, ut carere inferis possis. Cypr. Ep. ad Demetr. Ed. Ox. p. 191, 192. [1682.] Cum nobis sublimis vultus ab artifice Deo datus sit, apparet istas Religiones Deorum non esse rationis humanæ, qui (quæ) curvant cœleste animal ad

up to heaven, and so would have us to look up to heaven in the acts of our religion; that hence it appeared, that those religions could not be suitable to human reason, which caused this celestial being to bow down and venerate earthly things; and that he renounced the being, and the very name of man, who did not look upward, but downward, in his religious service of God."

That* "the heathens served God more purely when they had no image, and that their religion would have been better, if they had so continued."

§. 5. 5thly, From the consideration of the object worshipped by these images, and in honour of whom, by the heathens they were said to be made, or really were made, they frame these arguments against the adoration of them, *viz.*

That† "whatsoever deserveth to be called a god, or placed among the heavenly powers, if it be capable of laughter, will deride this kind of honour; or if prone to anger, will be provoked to indignation by it."

That‡ "if the gods be in heaven, it is a folly to direct our eyes to stones, and wood, and walls, when we address ourselves to them; and that we rather ought to direct our eyes to heaven where we believe they are. That§ it were better, wholly omitting these vain and insensate things, to direct our eyes thither, where is the seat and habitation of the God of heaven; and that God must be sought in the heavens, that we may be freed from hell."

That|| "the religion of the heathens is vain, because the

veneranda terrena. Lact. l. 2. c. 1. p. 139. [Ibid. p. 80.] *Ipsi ergo sibi renunciant, seque hominum nomine abdicant, qui non sursum aspirant sed deorsum.* P. 140. [Ibid.]

* August. de C. D. l. 4. ubi supra. [vol. 7. p. 111.]

† Arnob. l. 6. p. 189.

‡ Ibid. p. 195. supra.

§ Quanto igitur rectius est, omissis insensibilibus et vanis, oculos eo tendere ubi sedes, ubi habitatio est Dei veri? Lact. l. 2. c. 5. p. 161. [ut supra, p. 93.] Vid. p. 148.

|| Docui religiones Deorum triplici ratione vanas esse; una, quod simulacra ipsa quæ coluntur, effigies sunt hominum mortuorum. Lact. l. 2. c. 17. [c. 18.] p. 227. [Ibid. p. 137.] Quid sibi volunt ipsa simulacra, quæ aut mortuorum aut absentium monumenta sunt? nam omnino fingendarum similitudinum ratio idcirco ab hominibus inventa est, ut posset eorum memoria retineri, qui vel morte subtracti, vel absentia fuerant separati: Deos igitur in quorum numero reponimus! si in mortuorum, quis tam stultus ut colat? si in absentium, colendi ergo non sunt; si nec vident quæ facimus, nec audiunt quæ precamur. Lact. l. 2. c. 2. [Ibid. p. 81.]

images they worship are effigies of dead men. That images are either for the commemoration of the dead, or of the absent; it being therefore folly to adore either the dead or absent, it must be much more folly to adore their images."

§. 6. 6thly, From the form of images they also gather many reasons to condemn them; saying,

That* "the shape of a carved or painted image, through the gayness of the art, tends to debase the soul, and expose it to erroneous opinions of the Deity, to render vile and contemptible the Divine Majesty, and by a show of piety to make men wicked; and that therefore they refused to make or use them, and were by Moses forbidden so to do."

That† "images were rejected by them, because they could not without danger use them: for who, say they, adores or prays, looking upon an image, who is not so affected as to think to be heard by it? for the figure of the members almost extorts this; and this is the greatest cause of this mad impiety, that the form like unto one living, whose likeness makes it to be supplicated to, doth more prevail in the affections of miserable men, than the evidence that it doth not live at all, doth that it ought to be condemned by him who indeed is living: for images prevail more to bow down the unhappy soul, in that they have a mouth, eyes, ears, nostrils, hands, and feet, than these considerations can prevail

* *Opinio et mens imperitorum artis concinnitate decipitur.* Minuc. p. 25. Ὑμᾶς δὲ ἄλλη γοητεία ἀπατᾷ ἢ τέχνη, &c. Clem. Alex. protrept. p. 39. [ut supra, p. 51.] Ἐξευτελίζει γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σεμνότητα ἢ ἐν ἐτοιμῷ τοῦ ὀψεως συνηθείᾳ, καὶ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν δι' ὕλης σεβάσεσθαι ἀτιμαζειν ἰστὶν αὐτὴν δι' αἰσθήσεως. Strom. 5. p. 559. [Ibid. p. 662.] Species membrorum parit unoquoque sordidissimum erroris affectum, ut quoniam in illo figmento non invenit vitalem motum, credat numen occultum, effigiem tamen viventi corpori similem; seductus forma, et commotus auctoritate quasi sapientum institorum obsequentiumque turbarum, sine vivo aliquo habitatore esse non putat. August. in Psal. 113. p. 1306. [ut supra, vol. 4. p. 1261.] Orig. adv. Celsum, l. 8. p. 391. [ut supra, p. 757.]

† Quis autem adorat vel orat intuens simulacrum, qui non sic afficitur, ut ab eo se exaudiri putet?—Hoc enim facit, et quodammodo extorquet illa figura membrorum, ut animus vivens in sensibus corporis magis arbitretur sentire corpus, quod suo corpori simillimum videt. Illa causa est maxima impietatis insanæ, quod plus valet in affectibus miserorum similis viventi forma, quæ sibi efficit supplicari, quam quod eam manifestum est non esse viventem, ut debeat a vivente contemni. Plus enim valent simulacra ad curvandam infelicem animam, quod os habent, oculos, aures, manus, pedes habent, quam ad corrigendam, quod non loquuntur, &c. August. in Psal. 113. p. 1307. [Ibid. p. 1262.]

to correct the error of it, that they will not speak, see, smell, or walk.”

§. 7. 7thly, As to the extrinsical impulsive cause, or first inventor of images and image-worship, they declare expressly, That* “the devil and his angels were the inventors and introducers, both of the images and image-worship of heathen gods, and of the saints. That the devil brought into the world the artificers of images and statues. That they were evil angels who taught men to make them. That they had clearly proved that the first invention of images and statues was from the devil. That it was manifest, that this vain counsel of painting the visages of the saints was one of the methods of Satan, an invention of men acted by the devil.” For which assertions they are frequently anathematized, and condemned to hell by the second Nicene Council.

In a word, Lactantius not only laughs at them who kiss, and worship, and bow down to these great puppets,† as he thinks fit to call them, but also at the vanity of such as “adorn them with gold or jewels, that cover them with vails, or precious garments; that offer incense, or sweet odours, or consecrate gold or silver to them;” and who they are who do these things at present, we are not to learn.

§. 8. And now let any man of reason judge, whether all these considerations do not as much concern the images of saints, and even of our blessed Lord, as they concerned the images of heathen deities? Whether their images, as well as those of heathens, be not made of wood like to that we burn; or of polished earth like to that we tread upon, and trample under feet; and of which vessels are oft made for viler uses?

* *Artifices Statuarum et Imaginum, et omnis generis Simulacrorum diabolus sæculo intulit. Tertul. de Idol. c. 2. [c. 3.] [p. 36. Par. 1695.] Εὐδηλον ὡς καταλα ἡ τοιαύτη ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς, μεθοδείας εὖρημα. Theodotus Ancyr. apud 2 Nic. Conc. Art. 6. [ut supra,] p. 492. Προφάσει δικαίου αἰεὶ ὑπεισδύνων τὴν διάνοιαν ὁ διάβολος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνδροεικέλα ἀγάλματα διὰ ποικιλίας τεχνῶν διέγραψε. Epiph. Hær. 79. [vol. 1. p. 1061. Colon. 1680.] interprete Agobardo. Agit hoc nimirum versutus, et calidus humani generis inimicus, ut sub prætextu honoris sanctorum rursus Idola introducat, rursus per diversas effigies adoretur. De Imag. sect. 31. Ἠγοῦμαι διὰ τούτων ἀπεληλέγχθαι σαφῶς δαιμονικὴν τινα γεγενῆσθαι τὴν παλαιτάτην, καὶ πρώτην τῶν ξοάνων ἰδρυσιν. Euseb. Præpar. Evang. l. 4. c. 16. p. 161.*

† *Frustra igitur homines auro, ebore, gemmis Deos excolunt et exornant. Ergo his ludicris, et ornatis, et grandibus pupis, et unguenta, et thura, et odores inferunt, his peplos et indumenta pretiosa. L. 2. c. 4. p. 154, 157. [ut supra, p. 89.]*

Whether they be not sensual objects, things void of sense, and without life, motion, or ability to speak? Whether they be not made by the artificer, are not the work of servile artists, stone-cutters, mechanics? Whether they be not the works of men's hands? Whether they be not in the Roman Church adored, and revered by men made upright after God's image, and dedicated to his honour, and who have what images have not, and do what images cannot do? Whether any who adore them, desire to be like unto them? Whether the images which the Papists reverence, be not the images of heavenly powers, of beings now in heaven, the images of dead or absent persons, or made for the commemoration of such persons? And being so, whether these sayings of the Fathers do not equally concern them both? Or, whether they do not equally condemn the worship of the images of saints, and heathen deities? If then these very Fathers had themselves made and worshipped images subject to all, or any of these characters, and had received a tradition from Christ and his Apostles so to do themselves, and teach all Christians so to do, who can imagine that they would have spoken such plain and frequent contradictions, both to their practice and their doctrine, and talked as if they equally intended to condemn, and even ridicule the Christian and the heathen way of worship?

§ 9. Again, suppose the Fathers could have been thus destitute of common sense, and void of foresight, would not the heathens have taken this advantage to retort upon them all that they argued against their image worship; and tell them, that which they condemned in them, was only what themselves did daily practise, and taught all Christians to observe? Could Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, Eunapius, Julian, and all the other heathen wits, have wholly waived and neglected such a plain advantage? Put the case they heard these Fathers daily telling them, that it was a wickedness to adore that which was made on earth; that it was impious and foolish to adore the works of men's hands, or what was void of sense; that they renounced the name and being of a man, who bowed down to venerate earthly things; that they could not but judge them impotent and blind, who called such things sacred, or deemed it piety to adore them; and that they could not choose but laugh at and upbraid their folly. Should all the Pagans know, that what they thus objected against their image worship, was of equal force against that which them-

selves did daily practise ; that there were images in every Christian Church, made by men's hands of earth, as void of sense as any they adored ; and that the Christians did esteem, and call them sacred, adore, bow down to, venerate them ; could they abstain from saying, in the words of the Apostle, "Thou art inexcusable, O Christian, whoever thou art, that judgest us for doing these things ; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest dost the same things."

When this corruption began to spread itself through the Eastern Churches, and to be countenanced at Rome ; and many had submitted to these superstitious practices, the heathens presently began thus smartly to reply upon those Christians who condemned their image worship :* "What, have you not also in your Churches images of saints ; and do not you pay worship to them ? What is the practice of you Christians ?† do not you represent in images that which you call a God, *viz.* your Saviour ?‡ Why therefore do you complain of us, who are yourselves more superstitiously addicted to the like practices ?" The heathens, saith Tarasius, patriarch of C. P. and the great champion of image worship, defended their idols by condemnation of the martyrs, saying,§ "Why strive you with us, and refuse our images, when you have images of your own ?" Why is it then that the more ancient Pagans, Hierocles and Lucian, Porphyry and Celsus, Cæcilian and Symmachus, Julian, Eunapius, and others, object such things against the worship of the Christians, as were most evidently false, *viz.* the worship of the sun, an ass's head, of the clouds, and the priest's genitals ; or most apparently impertinent, as the worship of a crucified malefactor, but never mention this ; which if the practice of the Christians had given them occasion so to do, had been so proper, and so obvious, that the most rude and unskilful adversary could scarce neglect to mention or avoid taking notice of ? These persons, surely, neither wanted skill nor wisdom to know what made for their advan-

* 'Ο "Ελλην εἶπεν, ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις εἰκόνας ; οὐ γράφετε τοῖς ἁγίοις ὑμῶν, καὶ προσκυνεῖτε αὐτούς ; 2 Nic. Conc. Act. 5. [ut supra,] p. 353.

† Καὶ οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἁγίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ ὑμῶν. Ibid.

‡ Τί δὲ καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν ὁ φάτε θείον εἰκόσιν οὐκ ἐγχαράττετε ; πῶς οὖν διαλυοῦσθε ἡμῖν δεισιδαιμονέστερον ἐφ' ὁμοίαις πράξεσι διακείμενοι ; Act. 5. [Ibid.] p. 373.

§ Τὰ ἡμέτερα ὁμειώματα παραιτεῖσθε, ἔχοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἰδίας εἰκόνας. Ibid. p. 376.

tage, and what was proper to retort upon their adversaries. They had no kindness for the Christians, which might induce them to waive this obvious reply to these accusations of the Christians brought against them; nor could they possibly be ignorant of what the Christians practised in this kind, they being some of them apostates from the Christian faith, and admitted to their public worship. It is therefore certain, that the practice and doctrine of those purer ages gave them no occasion to retort these things.

§. 10. 3rdly, Let us reflect a little upon the language and deportment of those who have professedly admitted of the veneration of the images of Christ and of his saints, and see if we find any thing resembling these sayings of the Fathers in their words or actions. Since that this image worship hath obtained amongst the Latins, who ever heard such language from them? •

What Romanist will say, the Christian doctrine did not permit them to be solicitous about images and statues, but to relinquish them, to reject them; that Christ came to cause them to desist from the worship of them, and to elevate them from earthly images to heaven. Who of them will declare, that all the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin, which they solemnly adore at Rome, were falsely called images; that they were worse than mice, and worms, and moles? Who of them will pronounce it an insignificant and needless, a ridiculous, shameful, foolish, incongruous, perverse, impious, irreligious, heretical, heathenish, and devilish practice, to adore an image or a statue? Where shall we find amongst them these general axioms, that Christians must not worship that which is a creature, that which hath no sense; that it is impious and foolish to adore the work of men's hands; that this should be no part of the religion of a Christian; that it is a folly to adore the dead or absent, and much more folly to adore their images; that the devil brought into the world the artificers of images and statues? Since then the Fathers, without distinction or exception, do frequently assert these things, and many more of a like nature, it is evident they did not worship, or bow down to images, as do the members of the Church of Rome: for if no man would thus speak, who meaneth as the Papists do, surely these Fathers were far enough from their opinions. Is any man so void of understanding, that being only to declare that earthly princes are not to be obeyed and revered as gods, he should continually

teach, without all limitation and distinction, that earthly princes are not to be obeyed or revered? Since then the Fathers generally say, that images are not to be admitted or revered by any Christians; and that they ought not to bow down to them, and do not limit these expressions, it is exceeding clear that they intended not only to declare they were not to be worshipped with *latria*, but also that no outward and inferior worship should be given to them.

After the introduction of image-worship into the Eastern and some Western Churches, we find their language and their practice as opposite to these discourses of the Fathers, as is light to darkness. For then we never hear, that whatsoever is the work of an artificer, is vain, earthly, and profane; that nothing of this nature can be sacred, valuable, pious; but always speaking of their images, as in the second Nicene Council, under the titles of sacred, holy, venerable, adorable images. Then they professedly deny, condemn, endeavour to confute the axioms so frequent in these holy Fathers. For instance:

1. "Nothing is to be worshipped," say the Fathers, "which is made with hands; it is impious and foolish to adore τὰ χειροποίητα, things made with hands." This proposition those good Fathers will by no means admit of, without their restrictions;* "Thou hast written," saith P. Hadrian, to the Emperor Leo Isaurus, "that things made with hands are not to be venerated." And having called him,† "proud, arrogant dunce," he very learnedly informs him, "that this was only true of the *manufacta diaboli noxia et execranda*, hurtful and execrable *manufacta* of the devil, not of things made with hands for the ministry and glory of God." In his Epistle to the Emperors Constantinus and Irene, approved by the whole Council, he objects thus:‡ "You will say, that God himself forbids us to adore things made with hands;" and answers thus: That§ "every thing upon earth is made with hands, it being made by God;" and then flies to his old distinction,

* *Scripsisti non esse manufacta veneranda.* 2 Nic. Conc. [*Ibid.*] p. 10.

† *Indoctus, crassus, arrogans, superbus.* *Ibid.* *Manufacta diaboli noxia et execranda dicebat, non quæ sunt manufacta ad ministerium et gloriam Dei.*

‡ *Sed dices, quia ipse Deus interdixit adorare manufacta.* Act. 2. [*Ibid.*] p. 114.

§ *Quid est supra terram quod non sit manufactum, cum a Deo sit factum?* *Ibid.*

betwixt the images of demons and of saints. Theodorus, patriarch of Jerusalem, saith, that * “some contentious persons urge, that the images of saints ought not to be worshipped, as being made with hands. But let them know,” saith he, “that the cherubim, the ark, the propitiatory, the table, were by God’s precept made with hands, and were worshipped;” and then he rests in the distinction of Pope Hadrian. Leontius triumphs over this objection, thus:† “Tell me, thou, who thinkest nothing that is made with hands, and nothing created is to be adored; shalt thou kiss thy wicked wife, and may I not kiss the image of the blessed Virgin?”

These Fathers, many of them, clearly say, that “images were the invention of the devil:” and in that Council ‡ is pronounced an express anathema upon all that say so; and as I shall hereafter shew, they have either expressly, or in effect, denounced their anathemas against all these Fathers, and almost all that they have said.

§. 11. Moreover, in the late persecutions, in the days of Henry VII. the Papists forced Christians to renounce those very things as heresies, which are so fully and expressly here asserted by the Fathers. For instance:

1. The renunciations of some of them run thus:§ “I have kept and held, by the space of two years, one suspected Book of Commandments written in the same, that no man should worship any thing graven, or made with man’s hands; whereby, after that doctrine, I have believed, that no man ought to worship images.”

2. “I have misbelieved,|| and to divers manifestly shewed, that images of saints are not to be worshipped, after the doctrine of a Book of Commandments, which I have had in my keeping; wherein is written, that no man shall worship any thing made or graven with man’s hands; attending the words of the same literally, and not inclining to the sense of the same.”

3. “I have holden and believed, that the images of the

* Ὡς οὐ δὲ τῶν ἁγίων προσκυνεῖν τὰς εἰκόνας χειροποίητους οὐσας. Act. 3. [Ibid.] p. 185.

† Εἰπέ μοι ὁ νομίζων χειροποίητον μηδὲν ἢ ὅλως κτιστὸν προσκυνεῖν. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 237.

‡ Τοῖς λέγουσι διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας ἐφεύρεμα τὴν τῶν εἰκόνων ποίησιν ἀνάθεμα. Act. 1. p. 57. [Ibid.]

§ Thomas Taylor, Jan. 22, 1490.

|| Augustine Stere, Jan. 28, 1490.

crucifix, of our blessed lady, and of other holy saints, should not be worshipped; for nothing wrought, or graven with men's hands, ought to be honoured or lowted to, as I have read divers times in an English book that we call the Commandment Book."*

4. "I have believed, and divers times shewed, that images of saints be not to be worshipped, saying and holding, that no such thing is to be worshipped, that is graven and made with man's hands."†

5. "I have spoken against worshipping of images, that we shall worship no stocks, ne stones, ne nothing made or graven with man's hand; no likeness of things in heaven, or in earth."‡

6. "I have affirmed that images made of stocks and stones are not to be worshipped, or should not be worshipped, nor nothing made with man's hands."§

Some of them renounce and confess after this manner: "I have said them foolis which goeth to St. James in pilgrimage; adding, that St. James had no foot to come against them, no hand to welcom them, neither tong to speak to them; so reproving the worship of images."||

"I have openly said before divers, that images of saints be not to be worshipped; that when devout Christian people of their devotion, be wont to offer their candles burning to the image of St. Leonard, I have for their devotion called them fools: furthermore shewing in this wise, when St. Leonard woll ete a candle, and blow out an oder, then I will offer him a candle, else woll not: also, when I have seen cobwebs hanging before the face of the image of our lady, I have said, and reputed them fools that offereth to that image; but if she would blow away the same cobwebs from her face——"¶

"I have affirmed and said, that the crucifix, and other images in the Church, made of stocks and stones, are but idols, and ought not to be worshipped; adding, and saying, that Ball the carpenter, or Pyke the mason, could make as good as the crucifix, for it is but a crooked stick."**

"I have said, that no manner of image ought to be worshipped, for that they can neither smell, speak, nor hear."††

* Thom. Boughton, May 28, 1490.

† John Tanner, July 15, 1491.

|| Thomas Taylor. Ibid.

** Robert Makam, June 17, 1506.

† William Piour, Jan. 28, 1490.

§ Simon Waiver.

¶ Alice Higuel, Feb. 5, 1490.

†† John Bennet, Feb. 7, 1507.

Sometimes their confessions and abjurations run after this manner, *viz.*

“I have said, that it were better to give a poor, blind, or lame man a penny, than to bestow their money in pilgrimages, and worshipping the images of saints; for man is the very image of God, which ought all only to be worshipped, and no stocks, ne stones.”*

“I used to say, we should rather worship the image that God hath made, that is to say, the poor man, than the image that man hath made, and painted; the which standeth in the Church.”†

All these things they renounce, as “contrary to the common doctrine and determination of the universal Church of Christ, and as false doctrines, contrary to the Christian faith, as great heresies, and false opinions, reprovèd, and damned by all holy Church; and against the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles.” And yet these sayings, thus condemned by the second Nicene Council, and thus renounced as great heresies, in all parts where the power of the Church of Rome prevailed in these latter ages, are either the express sayings and doctrines of the ancient Fathers, or little different from them in sense; whence any man may easily discern how great an opposition there must be betwixt the doctrine of the ancient, and of the present Church of Rome; the true Catholic Church of Christ in the primitive ages, and that which now usurps the name of Catholic.

CHAP. III.

That the ancients did not bow down to, or venerate images, is farther proved: 1. Because they never were concerned, as are the Romanists, to answer the seeming repugnancy of this practice to the Second Commandment, or to use any of the distinctions so frequent in the second Nicene Council to that effect, §. 1. 2ndly, Because they answer all the objections urged by the Nicene Council, against the Protestant sense of this precept, viz. the instance of the cherubims, and of the brazen serpent, §. 2. 3rdly, Because many of them declare, that this precept rendered the very art of making images unlawful to the Christians, §. 3. 4thly, Because

* Isabel Dort, July 18, 1491. † Thomas Stochin, March 22, 1498.

they generally declare, that by this precept the Christian is forbid to give any outward worship to images, or to bow down to them, §. 4. 5thly, Because they reject and confute all the distinctions used by the second Nicene Council, and by the Romanists, to reconcile this precept to their practice; asserting, 1. That this command is moral and perpetual, and obligatory to all Christians. 2. That this precept doth not only forbid the worship of images with Latria, but all outward adoration of them. 3. That this is the Second Commandment, and not a part of the first only. 4. That not only idols, but images, are by this precept forbid to be adored, §. 5.

§. 1. THAT the ancients knew nothing of this pretended tradition, will be still more evident from their discourses touching that Commandment, which so expressly saith, “Thou shalt not make unto thyself an idol, nor the similitude of any thing in heaven or earth. For had they generally practised, had they received a tradition touching the veneration of the images of Christ, his blessed mother, and the saints and martyrs; is it not wonderful that none of all the Fathers ever did that which all Christians, who entertained the worship of them, ever did? viz. That they should never offer any answer to the obvious objection from this Commandment against it, or in the least attempt to reconcile this precept with their practice; or to propose any of those distinctions, limitations, or excuses, which are so frequent in the writings of the Romish doctors, and which they judge so necessary to prevent idolatry, and to inform aright the minds of them who venerate their images, and to satisfy the importunity of those who scruple at it, and do suspect it is a breach of this Commandment? The matter of this image worship looks so ill, it seems so manifestly repugnant to the command, forbidding us to worship any similitude of any thing in heaven and earth; it is in appearance so like to that very practice which they derided in the heathens, that it was highly reasonable, if this had been the doctrine and practice of their times, that these primitive Fathers should at least have considered, and stated the question, how far, and in what sense it was lawful; and with what intention and in what degree, and with what cautions and distinctions this might lawfully be done. The present doctors of the Church of Rome, are not so careless now-a-days, as were the Fathers in this matter. When they write

Catechisms for the instruction of the people; sometimes they* wholly leave out this Commandment; sometimes they do abbreviate it, and make it only say, "thou shalt not worship idols:" or if they be so daring as to present the whole Commandment to the view of Roman Catholics, they carefully expound, and clog it with many limitations and distinctions, that their proselytes may not be tempted to think the words do mean what, in their plain and obvious sense, they do import.

Thus was it also with the bishops of the second Nicene Council, who introduced this image worship into the Eastern Church. Constantinus, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, seems to insinuate, that the reason which moved God to make this injunction, was not the evil of image worship, but the propenseness of the Jews unto idolatry: for, saith he,† "when the people were moved to commit idolatry, then God spake thus to Moses, Thou shalt make no similitude to serve them." In other places they affirm, that God doth only here forbid‡ the worship of them with *latría*; § the worshipping of images as gods, but not the worship of them with *doulía*; and often do observe, that προσκύνησις, || or outward worship, by saluting, or bowing of the body, is not appropriated to God, but is an honour oft given to the creatures, and therefore is such worship as may be given to images. And sure it may be charitably presumed, that the Fathers of the primitive Church were as heartily concerned for the instruction of their flocks, and were as able to perceive as Roman Catholics, that seeming opposition which the veneration of images bears to this Commandment; and yet we do not find in all their writings, for five hundred years, one caution to inform the people, that this law concerned not that image-worship they are supposed to have practised, and derived down unto posterity.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian, and other writers of the ancient Church, make frequent mention of this precept, especially when they discourse against that image-worship which the heathens practised; but they afford not one iota

* Vid. Dall. de Imag. p. 77.

† "Ὅτε δὲ ἐκινεῖτο ὁ λαὸς πρὸς εἰδωλολάτρειαν, τῆνικαῦτα ὁ Θεὸς εἶπε τῷ Μωσέϊ, οὐ ποιήσεις πᾶν ὁμοίωμα πρὸς τὸ λατρεῦσαι αὐτοῖς. Act. 4. [ut supra,] p. 200. Vid. Act. 6. p. 468.

‡ Ἀσπασμόν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν, οὐ μὲν τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 556, 584.

§ Μὴ προσκυνεῖν ὡς Θεόν. Act. 5. [Ibid.] p. 355, 376, 412.

|| Τὴν μὲν προσκύνησιν ἀπολύτως καὶ οὐ μόνον εἴρηκεν, τὸ δὲ λατρεύσεις αὐτῷ μόνον εἴρηκεν. Act. 7. [Ibid.] p. 584. Act. 4. p. 248.

to distinguish that worship they condemned in the heathens, from that which they are said to have given to the images of Christ, and of his saints ; or to except them from the censure they so generally pass upon all image worship ; or to inform us, that the worship of such images is well consistent with the second Commandment.

§. 2. To make this argument yet more convincing, let it be considered, that these very Fathers thought themselves concerned to answer those objections which Papists now, and other worshippers of images before them, made against that sense of the Commandment which Protestants embrace, viz. that “ God by it forbids all outward worship, or veneration, to be paid to images.”

For whereas they object the cherubims* placed in the Jewish temple ; Tertullian answers, that when God forbade “ the making the likeness of any thing in heaven or earth ;” in the next words, “ Thou shalt not worship them, he shewed the cause of that prohibition was the removal of idolatry ; and therefore,” saith he, “ the cherubims† seem not here forbidden, because they were not made for worship, but for ornament.”

Clemens of Alexandria to the same instance answers,‡ that “ the cherubims were the symbols of angels glorified, not the images of saints ; for he who had advised them to make no graven idol, would not himself have made the image of saints, or holy things.”

2ndly, The framing of the brazen serpent by Moses, is also pleaded in favour of image-worship in the second Nicene Council.§ Now to this Tertullian answers, that “ this was done by Moses,|| not as an image of idolatry, but as a figure

* *Ἰστώσαν οἱ λέγοντες, μὴ δεῖν τῶν ἁγίων προσκυνεῖν τὰς εἰκόνας χειροποιήτους οὐσας—ὡς τὰ χειρουβίμ· χειροποίητα ἦσαν, καὶ προσκυνοῦντο.* Theodorus Patr. Hieron. 2 Concil. Nicen. Act. 3. [Ibid.] p. 185. Vid. Act. 4. p. 197, 236. Act. 6. p. 468. Act. 2. p. 107, 115.

† Sic Cherubim et Seraphim—certe simplex ornamentum, longe diversas habendo causas ab Idololatriæ conditione, ob quam similitudo prohibetur. Contr. Marc. 1. 2. c. 22. [p. 392. Par. 1695.]

‡ Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε ὁ μηδὲν γλυπτὸν εἶδωλον δημιουργεῖν παραινέσας αὐτὸς ἀπεικόνισεν τῶν ἁγίων ἀγαλμα. Strom. 1. 5. c. [p.] 564. [ut supra, p. 667.]

§ Πλὴν δεῖξω σοι ὅτι καὶ Μωσῆς ὁ ταῦτα νομοθετήσας ἐκελεύθη—καὶ τὸν ἥφιν τὸν χαλκοῦν δημιουργῆσαι. Act. 5. [ut supra,] p. 356, 357. Act. 2. p. 108, 109.

|| Non in Idololatriæ titulum, sed in figuram remedii. Contr. Marc. 1. 2. c. 22. Non ad derogationem legis, sed ad exemplarium causæ suæ. L. de Idol. c. 5. [Ibid. p. 88.]

of their remedy ;” that it was done, “ not in derogation to the law, but as a figure of the cross.”

Justin Martyr* in like manner saith, that “ it was a figure of the blessed Jesus, who was to save us from the bitings of the old serpent, for otherwise,” saith he, “ how can we reconcile it with the command of the same God to make no kind of image ?”

Tertullian speaks thus to the Christian, “ If thou observest the same God, thou hast his law, make no similitude ; if thou respectest the precept of the similitude that afterwards was made, imitate thou Moses ; make no image against the law, unless God also do command thee.”†

3rdly, To the objection made by Damascen,‡ and before him by Celsus, that “ God made man after his own image,” Origen replies, that “ it is one thing to be an image of God, another thing to be made after his image.”§ And that “ this image of God is preserved in the rational soul, made like in virtue to him,” not in the lineaments of the body.

These are the exceptions made against this law, which the ancient Fathers diligently take notice of, and shew not to be breaches of, or contradictions to this precept. Whereas, had then the Christians been accustomed to worship or bow down before the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin, and the saints departed, this practice would have ministered more weighty scruples to employ their pens : and therefore we have reason to conclude, their practice gave them no occasion to answer those objections which the Romanists are so industrious to solve, and they who were concerned about lesser matters never mention.

§. 3. But then if we consider, that these Fathers, who are so profoundly silent in the particulars now mentioned, so unconcerned to shew that any veneration of any images whatsoever was any ways consistent with this precept, are very loud and frequent in declaring, as many of them do, that this Commandment rendered the very art of making images unlawful to

* Just. M. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 321, 322.

† Ne facias adversus legem simulacrum aliquod, nisi et tibi Deus jussit. De Idol. cap. 5. [Ibid. p. 88.]

‡ De fide Orth. cap. 93.

§ Μη ἰδὼν διαφορὰν εἰκόνας Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ. L. 7. p. 376. [Ibid. p. 741.] Τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ἐν ψυχῇ λογικῇ τῇ ποιῶ κατ’ ἀρετὴν σὺζεσθαί φαμεν. Ibid. vid. l. 8. p. 389. [Ibid. p. 756.]

the Christian, that with one voice they say, that "it forbade all outward veneration, and bowing down to any images whatsoever;" and that they do as fully contradict, and overthrow all the distinctions, shifts, and excuses of the Romanists, whereby they do endeavour to avoid the condemnation of this law: I say, when we consider this, we cannot have the least suspicion left, that they should practise in their actions, or in mind approve, what they in words have so fully condemned. And,

1. We find that many of them have declared expressly, that God by this Commandment forbade the very making of an image, and rendered the very art of painting and engraving images unlawful to the Christian.

Clemens of Alexandria styles it *κακοτεχνία*,* "an evil art:" and adds, that "we Christians plainly are forbidden to exercise this deceitful art, the prophet having said, 'Thou shalt not make the similitude of any thing in heaven or in earth.'"

Origen declares, that "the Jewish polity admitted of no painter or statuary, the law ejecting all such out of it."† And all these arts of graving and of painting images, he also styles "arts of wickedness." And again, "As for painters, carvers, image-makers, we think that they who do respect their evil arts, not taking off their minds from all things visible and sensible, to fix them upon him who is light, are yet in darkness."‡

Tertullian saith, "Even of the works of such persons, I inquire, whether it can please that God who forbade any likeness to be made, how much more of his image? The author of truth loves not what is false; whatsoever is feigned is adultery with him. The divine law proclaims, Thou shalt make no idol: and adding, neither the likeness of any thing in heaven or earth; hath, through the world, forbidden the servants of God to exercise such arts."§ And to this objec-

* Προτρεπτ. p. 30. Ἀπηγόρευται ἡμῖν ἀναφανδὸν ἀπατηλὸν ὀριζεσθαι τέχνην. P. 41.

† Ἐκβάλλοντας πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους ἀπ' αὐτῆς τοῦ νόμου, l. 4. p. 181. [Ibid. p. 524.] Τῶν ζωγράφων, καὶ ἀνδριαντοποιῶν κακοτεχνίαι, l. 6. p. 321. [Ibid. p. 682.]

‡ Φήσομεν καθῆσθαι μὲν ἐν σκότῳ πάντας τοὺς εἰς τὰς τῶν ζωγράφων, καὶ πλαστῶν, καὶ ἀνδριαντοποιῶν ἐνορῶντας κακοτεχνίας, &c. l. 6. p. 321.

§ Jam vero ipsum opus personarum quæro, an Deo placeat qui omnem similitudinem vetat fieri? De Spect. cap. 23. [Ibid. p. 82.] Et conjungens, neque similitudinem, &c. toto mundo ejusmodi artibus interdixit servis Dei. De Idol. c. 4. [Ibid. p. 87.]

tion of the image-maker, "I have no other trade to live upon;" he answers, "What hast thou to do with God, if thou wilt live by thy own laws?*" the Church permits all men to labour, but not to labour in those arts which the discipline of God receives not."

Chrysostom says,† "I condemn the arts of making pictures as no arts, for they only tend to superfluous expense; whereas the name of arts is only to be given to those trades which appertain to things necessary, and belonging to the life of man. For God for this cause gave us wisdom, that we might find out methods by which we might advantage our life. But tell me, where is the profit of making little images or animals on walls or garments?"

And lastly, The Council of Constantinople,‡ consisting of 338 bishops, called this τὴν ἀθέμιτον τῶν ζωγράφων τέχνην, "the unlawful art of making pictures." Judge, therefore, whether the Christians of those first five centuries, could have any custom received from tradition, to adore what they declared unlawful for any Christian man to make, though he did not adore it: whether they held it necessary that images should be worshipped, who held it both superfluous and wicked that they should be made?

§. 4. But, 2ndly, these Fathers do with one voice declare, that by this precept the Christian is forbidden to worship, to bow down, or to give outward veneration to any image whatsoever.

Origen, in that very homily upon Exodus, which Romanists do cite in favour of their exposition of the word *idol*, to signify a thing that hath no real being in the world, is very clear in this particular, declaring,§ that "the command forbiddeth not only to make an idol, but also the similitude of all things; so that if any man, in any metal of gold, silver, wood, or stone, makes the resemblance of any four-footed beast, serpent, or

* Patet Ecclesia omnibus, si nulla exceptio est artium, quas Dei disciplina non recipit, c. 5. [Ibid. p. 88.]

† 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν ζωγραφικὴν οὐδὲ τὴν ποικιλικὴν εἰποιμι ἀνέγωγε τέχνην εἶναι—τὸ δὲ ζῶδια γίνεσθαι, ἢ ἐν τοίχοις, ἢ ἐν ἱματίοις, ποῦ χρήσιμον εἶπέ μοι. In Matt. Hom. 49. p. 316, 317. [vol. 7. p. 509. Par. 1727.]

‡ Apud Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 6. [ut supra,] p. 425. Τῶν ζωγράφων κακοτέχνια. Ibid. p. 505.

§ Quæ nunc sermo Dei universa complectens simul abjurat et abjicit, et non solum idolum fieri vetat, sed et similitudinem omnium in terra, &c. Hom. 8. in Exod. [vol. 2. p. 158. Par. 1733.]

bird, and sets it up to be adored, he maketh not an idol, but a similitude; or, if he make a picture to that end, he doth the same: and, that the word of God, comprehending all these things together, casts away and abjures them; and doth not only forbid an idol to be made, but also the similitude of all things which are on the earth, in the waters, and the heavens; adding, and saying, Thou shalt not adore nor worship them. Now,* it is one thing to adore, and another thing to worship; for a man may unwillingly adore, as they who flatter kings, who are addicted to such things, may seem to adore idols, when in their hearts they know an idol is nothing in the world; but to worship, is to be devoted to them with our whole affection and study; both which the divine word cuts off, providing, that thou shouldest neither worship them with any affection, nor adore them in appearance or external show."

The other author whom they cite to countenance their exposition of the word *idol*, is Theodoret, who there declares indeed, that "idols signify things which have no existence:" but then he adds, that "similitudes here signify the images of things subsistent, as of the sun, moon, stars, and men; which things," saith he,† "the Commandment enjoins us neither to worship outwardly, nor with *latría*, or with the worship of the soul, teaching both these kinds of worship to be wicked."

Clemens of Alexandria writing against the Antitactes, who rejected the God of the Old Testament, and acted in opposition to his commands, tells them, that if they would act suitably to their principles, "seeing God, by Moses, had forbidden to make any graven or molten images, they should adore them;"‡ plainly insinuating, that this adoration was forbidden by this precept. I have already shewed, that Origen§ declares, that Christians abstained from the worship of all images by virtue of this command, and that which saith, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." And Tertullian, that the cherubims seem therefore not to be

* Aliud est colere, aliud adorare; potest quis et invitatus adorare—colere vero est toto his affectu et studio mancipari: utrumque ergo resecat sermo divinus, ut neque affectu colas, neque specie adores. Ibid. [col. 2.]

† Τούτοις κελεύει μήτε προσκυνεῖν, μήτε λατρεύειν, ἐπειδὴ συμβαίνει τινὰς προσκυνῆσαι οὐ μὴν καὶ λατρεύσαι κατὰ ψυχὴν, εἰδὼς ὡς ἐκότερον ἀσεβές, in Exod. q. 38. [vol. 1. p. 149. Hal. 1769.]

‡ Ὑμᾶς ἀκόλουθον ἦν καὶ τὰ γλυπτὰ προσκυνεῖν. Strom. 1. 3. p. 441. [ut supra, p. 528.]

§ L. 7. p. 375 [ut supra, vol. 1. p. 740.]

forbidden here, because they were not made for worship, but ornament. Epiphanius saith, that “if the Son of God had been a creature, God would not have propounded him to be worshipped, he himself having said, Thou shalt not make to thyself any similitude, and thou shalt not worship it.”* “God,” saith Fulgentius,† “in the first precept of the Decalogue, most vehemently forbade all the faithful to give adoration or service to any creature: and commanding himself to be adored, he wholly forbade that any one should dare to adore or serve a creature. And therefore in the end of that first commandment, he speaketh thus of all things he created, Thou shalt not worship them, nor serve them.”

In the sixth and seventh centuries, when the historical use of images began to find admittance in the Church, and Christians were permitted to adorn the walls and windows of the church with them; or to engrave and paint them, the better to express or represent the history of parables recorded in Scripture, they do excuse themselves from being thereby guilty of the breach of this commandment, or any other of like nature, by this distinction, that they had pictures “only for remembrance, not for religious veneration.”

Thus when Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, finding his people prone to worship images, did, after the example of good Hezekiah, break and remove them from the Church, though Gregory the Great approves not of his breaking of them, yet he commends his “zeal against the adoration of what was made with hands;” declaring it “the people’s sin, which was to be forbidden by all means;” and bids him, “calling them together, shew, from the testimonies of Scripture, that it is not lawful to adore any thing that was made with hands, because it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”‡ He adds, that he was moved with

* Πῶς οὖν ἔκτισεν αὐτῷ νῦν, καὶ ἐπέταξε προσκυνεῖσθαι. Hær. 69. p. 759. [Colon. 1680.]

† Omni creaturæ adoratio et servitus vehementissime prohibetur—Prorsus interdixit ne quis auderet creaturam adorare, creaturæque servire. Ad Donat. p. 592, 593. [p. 372, 373. Colon. Agrip. 1526.]

‡ Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari possit, habuisse, laudamus, sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse judicamus. Tua Fraternitas ab earum adratu populum prohibere debuit, L. 7. Ep. 110. Convocandi sunt, eisque sacræ Scripturæ est testimonis ostendendum, quod omne manufactum adorare non licet, quoniam scriptum est, Dominum Deum tuum adorabis; si quis imagines facere voluerit, minime prohibe, adorare vero omnibus modis veta. Al. de Vi a Ep. l. 9. c. 9.

an inconsiderate zeal in breaking of them, to prevent their being worshipped, "because they were set up in churches, not to be adored, but only to instruct the minds of the simple," and especially the Pagans, which abounded in his diocese; and that it was "one thing to adore a picture, and another, by the history of a picture, to learn what was to be adored." Where this great Pope, without distinction or limitation, condemns all adoration of an image, declaring, in opposition to the Fathers of the second Nicene Council,* that "nothing was to be adored, which was made with hands:" and proving this from that very testimony of Scripture, which in that Council is twice said to make nothing against the adoration of them, because the word "only" is not joined to adoration, but to the service of *latria*. He also doth command Serenus to forbid the adoration of them, *omnibus modis*, "by all manner of ways;" opposing to this forbidden adoration, the having of "them only for instruction;"† which manifestly proves, that the adoration rejected and condemned by him, as contrary to the holy Scriptures, was all kind of adoration, all, that is, more than using of them for instruction only.

To weaken this plain testimony of so great a Pope, they have since put words into an epistle, writ by him to Secundinus the monk, in which he is made to speak according to the late distinctions of the schools; and to admonish that monk not to worship the image of our Saviour, "as a God;"‡ and to inform him, that "Christians do not prostrate themselves before it, as before the Divinity;" concluding hence, that he elsewhere condemned only the worshipping of images as gods: but the gross forgery is happily detected by the industry of Dr. James,§ who collated this epistle with seven good manuscripts, in all which no such words are to be found.

"No word of God forbids that images be made," saith Bede,|| "but it by all means doth forbid that they be made unto this end, *viz.* that they be worshipped and adored."

* Act. 4. [ut supra,] p. 248. 7. 584.

† *Frangi non debuit, quod non adorandum in ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas solum modo mentes nescientium collocatum. Ibid.*

‡ *Imaginem Salvatoris nostri non ideo petis, ut quasi Deum colas. Nos quidem non, quasi ante Divinitatem, ante illum prosternimur. Epist. l. 7. Ep. 54.*

§ Corruption of the true Fathers, p. 75, 76.

|| Apud Gerson. Comp. Theol. Expl. 1. Præcept. tom. 2. F. 25. [par. 2. p. 53. Par. 1606.]

"This command," saith Agobardus,* "must not be only understood of the similitude of false gods, but also of the heavenly creatures, or of those things which human fancy hath invented for the honour of God." And from them, and the 4th of Deuteronomy, he saith, "this chiefly ought to be observed, that if the workmanship of God's hand is not to be adored, no not in honour of that God who made it, much less may we adore the workmanship of man in honour of those persons whose images they are said to be."† And hence, as you have seen already, the Councils of Frankfort, and Paris, and the Western clergy, condemned the decree of the second Nicene Council, as being *contra auctoritatem divinam, et Scripturarum tramitem*, against divine authority, and the course of Scriptures.

§. 5. Moreover, these Fathers clearly and abundantly confute all the distinctions used by the Romanists, and by the second Nicene Council, to reconcile their practice with this precept, and all the specious pleas they have invented for this end, as *v. g.*

1. Do they, with Mr. Thorndyke, say, that this commandment is not perpetual and moral, and so not obligatory to the Christian?‡

The Fathers generally assert against them, that all the precepts of the Decalogue, except only the carnal observation of the Sabbath, oblige all Christians; that the words of the Decalogue "Christ spake alike to all, and therefore they remain alike with us, receiving their augmentation and extension, but not their dissolution from our Saviour's advent," they being natural and common to all. That they were not only spoken to the Israelites going out of Egypt, *sed multo magis ad te*, § "much more to the Christian." "What, shall we say that the Decalogue, excepting the carnal observation of

* Non de solis similitudinibus alienorum Deorum, sed et de cœlestibus creaturis. Lib. de Imag. [ut supra,] p. 221.

† Quanto magis opera manuum hominum non sunt adoranda et colenda, nec in honore eorum, quorum similitudines esse dicuntur? [Ibid.] p. 222.

‡ Num Deus primum per naturalia præcepta, quæ ab initio infixæ dedit hominibus, admonens eos, id est, per Decalogum, quæ si quis non fecerit, non habeat salutem, et nihil plus ab eis exquisivit. Iren. l. 4. c. 28. [c. 15. p. 244. col. 1. Venet. 1734.] et c. 31. [p. 247. col. 2.] Decalogi quidem verba ipse per semetipsum omnibus similiter Dominus locutus est, et ideo similiter permanent apud nos, extensionem et augmentum, sed non dissolutionem accipientia per carnalem ejus adventum.

§ Origen. Hom. 8. [ut supra, vol. 2. p. 156.] in Exod.

the sabbath, doth not belong to us? * Who is so wicked," saith St. Austin, "as to say, that therefore he observeth not those precepts because he is a Christian?"

Clemens of Alexandria,† Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, Epiphanius, Austin, Fulgentius, do urge this precept upon Christians; and some of them expressly say, that it concerns not only Jews, but Christians also. And even the Trent Catechism teacheth, that "all the precepts of the Decalogue, except the fourth, are natural and perpetual, and cannot be changed; so that although the law of Moses be abrogated, yet Christian people are to observe all the commands of the two tables, not because Moses did command them, but because they are agreeable to nature, and that constrains them so to do."‡

Do they say with the second Nicene Council,§ that "this precept only forbids the worshipping of images as gods," or giving of *latria* to them, but not the paying of "external honorary worship," or outward adoration to them? "Note the propriety of the words," saith Jerome, "neither worship of the gods, nor adoration of the image, is agreeable to the servants of God." "The command forbids both inward worship, and external adoration," say Origen and Theodoret. "Thou shalt not worship them with the veneration of thy body, nor the affection of thy mind,"|| saith Gerson. Origen declares,¶ that they who abjured Christianity in times of persecution, made the same excuse as doth the second Nicene Council in this matter, *viz.* that οὐ λατρεύουσι μὲν, προσ-

* Numquid propterea dicturi sumus, non ad nos pertinere quod scriptum est, maximeque ipsum Decalogum, qui duabus illis lapideis tabulis continetur, excepta Sabbati observatione carnali, quæ spiritualem sanctificationem quietemque significat? Quis enim dicat non debere observare Christianos, 1. ut uni Deo Religionis obsequia serviant, 2. ut Idolum non colatur, 3. ut nomen Domini non accipiat, 4. ut vanum, 5. ut Parentes honorentur, ne 6. Homicidia, 7. Adulteria, 8. Furta, 2. falsa Testimonia perpetrentur, ne 10. Uxor, ne omnino res ulla concupiscatur aliena? Quis est tam impius, ut dicat ideo se ista legis non custodire præcepta, quia est ipse Christianus, nec sub lege, sed sub gratia constitutus? Contra duas Epist. Pelag. l. 3. c. 4. p. 899.

† Vid. Sect. 4.

‡ Ut quamvis lex Moysis abrogata sit, omnia tamen præcepta quæ duabus tabulis continentur, populus Christianus servet. Part. 3 cap. 4. sect. 4. [p. 325. Lips. 1843.]

§ Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 248. Act. 5. p. 356, 376. Act. 7. p. 556, 584.

|| In Dan. iii. [vol. 5. p. 638. Par. 1736.]

¶ Exhort. ad Mart. p. 167.

κυνοῦσι δὲ εἰδώλοις, “they gave not *latría*, but only outward worship or veneration to the idols.” But to this Romish shift he thus replies, that “this excuse would also free the Jews from the like guilt in worshipping the gods of Moab, and the golden calf;” for he observeth, that “the Scripture* saith not of them who went a whoring after the gods of Moab, ἐλάτρευσαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν, they gave *latría* to their idols; for it could not be,” saith he, “after so many signs and wonders, which their eyes had seen, that they should presently be brought, πρὸς τὸ νομίσαι Θεοὺς τὰ εἰδῶλα, to think the idols, with which they fornicated, were indeed gods. Thus also,” saith he, “very likely did the Jews προσκυνεῖν, outwardly adore the calf, οὐ λατρεύσαντες τῷ μόσχῳ ὃν γινόμενον ἐθέασαντο, not giving divine worship to that which they had seen then made.” And indeed, evident it is, that the similitude of any thing is not the thing itself; and therefore the command forbidding us to “worship the similitude of any thing in heaven or earth,” cannot be reasonably supposed only to forbid us to worship a similitude of God, as God.

3rdly, Do they, to give some colour to this subterfuge, assert, that what we call the Second Commandment, is indeed part of the first? The Jews, and Christian Fathers, excepting only St. Austin and Fulgentius, do, with one voice, declare the contrary. “The first commandment,”† saith Josephus, “teacheth, that God is one, and that he only should be worshipped; the second commands us, not to make the image of any living thing to worship it.” “The first,”‡ saith Philo, “is about monarchy; the second about things made with hands, not suffering us to prepare images, or statues, as those hurtful arts of painting and engraving do.” Theophilus§ reckons these δεκακεφάλαια, or Ten Commandments, thus: 1. “Thou shalt have no other gods but me.” 2. “Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, or the similitude of any thing,” &c. 10. “Thou shalt not covet the house of thy neighbour, nor desire his wife,” &c. Clemens of Alexandria declares,

* Numb. xxv. 2, 3.

† Διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὁ μὲν πρῶτος λόγος, ὅτι Θεός ἐστιν εἷς, καὶ τοῦτον σίβεισθαι μόνον· ὁ δὲ δεύτερος κελεύει μηδενὸς εἰκόνα ζώου ποιήσαντας προσκυνεῖν. Orig. l. 3. c. 4. Archæol. lib. 3. c. 5. p. 129. Amst. 1726.]

‡ Ἀγάλματα καὶ ξάνα καὶ συνόλως ἀφιδρῦματα κατασκευάζειν οὐκ ἐῶν. Libr. de Decal. p. 590. [vol. 2. p. 205. Lond. 1742.]

§ Ad Autolyc. l. 3. p. 23. [p. 217. Oxon. 1684.]

that* “the first command shews, that there is one only God omnipotent, and forbids idolatry; the second is against giving of his name to vain things, which artificers have made.” “Should these two be numbered as one,”† saith Origen, “the number of ten commandments would not be complete; but if you reckon them as we do, the truth of the Decalogue will remain; wherefore the first commandment is this, Thou shalt have no other gods but me; the second, Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, or any similitude, &c.” “Of the Ten Commandments, the first,”‡ saith Athanasius, “is this, I am the Lord thy God; the second, Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, or the similitude of any thing.” St. Jerome§ reckons four commandments of the first table, and saith, “a promise was added to the second of them.” To all these may be added, Tertullian against Marcion,|| and against the Jews:¶ the Constitutions** under the name of Clement: Sulpitius Severus†† in his sacred history: Pseud-Ambrosius‡‡ on the 6th chapter to the Ephesians: the imperfect work upon St. Matthew,§§ passing under the name of Chrysostom: Procopius Gazæus||| upon Exodus: Zonaras¶¶ in his Annals, with divers others. And if that which we style the Second Commandment, be only a part and explication of that precept, “Thou shalt have no other gods but me,” it only can forbid what is forbidden in that precept, *viz.* the giving of that worship which is due to God to any image: whence it will follow, that to bow down, to kiss, offer incense to the images of heathen deities, or of the very devil, is not a thing forbidden by this precept, since by such actions, say the second Nicene Council, and the Roman doctors, we do not worship images as

* “Α δὲ οἱ τεχνῖται τῶν ἀνθρώπων πεποιήκασιν. Strom. l. 6. p. 682. [ut supra, p. 810.]

† Si ita putetur non complebitur decem numerus mandatorum, et ubi jam erit Decalogi veritas? Hom. 8. in Ex. [vol. 2. p. 156. col. 2. Par. 1733.]

‡ Δευτέραν οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ εἰδωλον, &c. Synops. p. 64. [vol. 2. p. 101. Patav. 1777.]

§ Et in secundo præcepto repromissionem esse sociatam. Eph. 6. F. 104. [vol. 7. p. 663. Veron. 1737.]

|| L. 2. c. 17. [ut supra, p. 390.]

¶ Cap. 2. [Ibid. p. 184.]

** L. 2. 36. [vol. 1. p. 271. Lut. Par. 1671.] l. 7. 3. [Ibid. p. 416.]

†† L. 1. p. 93. [p. 49. Lugd. Bat. 1643.]

‡‡ P. 554. [vol. 2. Append. p. 249. Par. 1690.]

§§ Hom. 49. p. 175. [vol. 6. Append. f. ccv. col. 2. Par. 1724.]

||| P. 273.

¶¶ Tom. 1. p. 24.

gods: and if the paying this inferior worship to the images of heathen deities be not forbidden in the words of this commandment, I conceive it cannot be reasonably thought to be forbidden in any other precept, there being only this which speaks of image-worship; and if it were forbidden in no precept of the moral law, it necessarily will follow that it was lawfully performed by the heathens.

4thly, Do they pretend that idols only are forbidden to be adored in this precept, but not images? This indeed is the conceit of Romish doctors, and of the second Nicene Council; but this also is plainly opposite unto the general tradition of all the Fathers of the Church, who constantly observe what is as evident in the commandment as words can be, *viz.* that it forbids not only idols to be worshipped, but also "the similitude of any thing whatsoever:" as besides the express testimonies of Clemens of Alexandria, Theophilus, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, St. Austin, and Fulgentius, produced already, is farther evident from the express assertions of Justin Martyr,* in his dialogue with Trypho; of Cyprian† in his third book to Quirinus; of Julius Firmicus,‡ in his Treatise of Profane Religion; of Nazianzen§ in his Verses; of the Pseud-Ambrosius|| upon the 6th chapter of the Ephesians; of Theodoret¶ in his Questions upon Exodus; and innumerable other authors.

To all which add that of Tertullian, that "every form or little representation is an idol; and all service performed about it is idolatry."** That of the Council of Frankfort, "We do not call the images placed in churches, idols; but we refuse to worship and adore them, lest they should be called idols."†† That of Agobardus, that "if they who have left the worship of dæmons should be commanded to venerate the images of saints, I think they should seem to others, not so much to have left idols, as have changed their resemblances."‡‡ Add lastly, the complaint of all the Fathers against the Arians, that by introducing the adoration of a creature, they brought

* P. 321, 322.

† C. 59. [p. 587. Venet. 1728.]

‡ P. 39.

§ Carm. p. 99. [Par. 1630.]

|| P. 554. [ut supra.]

¶ Qu. 38. [ut supra.]

** Omnis forma, vel formula Idolum. De Idol. c. 3. [ut supra, p. 87.]

†† Sed ne Idola nuncupentur, adorare eas et colere recusamus. Lib. Car. l. 4. c. 18. [ut supra, p. 582.]

‡‡ Puto quod videretur eos non tam Idola reliquisse, quam simulacra mutasse. De Imag. [ut supra,] p. 248.

in αἵρεσις εἰδωλοποιός, “an idol-making heresy ;” under “the pretext of Christianity, they secretly introduced the worship of idols, and transgressed that precept which forbade the adoration of an idol, or of any similitude ;” clearly insinuating, that by worshipping any creature it was made an idol.

Since then the Fathers of the second Nicene Council, and the Romish doctors, do with such diligence inculcate these distinctions and limitations of this precept, seeing they were so much concerned to blanch and colour over the seeming opposition of their practice to it : and since the Fathers must have had the like occasions, reasons and inducements so to do ; if they had practised the same custom of making and adoring the images of Christ and of his saints, and yet they never in the least concern themselves about this matter, never use any of these limitations or distinctions, nor any other of like nature in their own defence, but do as manifestly reject, condemn, and overthrow them all, as any Protestant could do.

Since, 2ndly, they thought themselves obliged to shew that which comparatively concerned them little, *viz.* that the making of the cherubims, and of the brazen serpent by Moses, and the making man after his image by God himself, did no way thwart this precept, but yet were wholly unconcerned to add, that the making and adoring of the images of Christ and of his saints was also well consistent with it ; since they do often say, that notwithstanding this command it might be lawful for the Jew to make an image where there was no peril of worshipping or bowing down to it ; and it was also lawful for the Christians to have “their cups and dishes for the sacramental bread and wine, and other utensils ;” * and that such things were not condemned by this commandment, or to be ranked with what was here forbidden ; but yet they never go about to prove that it was lawful, notwithstanding this command, to have or worship images of Christ, or any of his saints. Since even in the following ages, when images began to be received into churches, they still declared they did not violate this precept, because they had them “not for adoration, but only for commemoration ;” and that this precept forbade them not to make, though it by all means forbade them to adore an image.

3rdly, Since many of them have declared expressly, that God by this command forbade the very making of an image, and rendered the very art of painting and engraving unlawful

* August. in Psalm. cxiii. [vol. 4. p. 1262. Par. 1681.]

to the Christian ; and they more generally do assert, that he by it forbade even all "outward adoration of them," and consequently expressly must declare themselves transgressors of it, and practisers of wicked worship, if they both made and gave external adoration to the images of saints.

And, 4thly, since they plainly argue against all honorary worship of them thus : that "if the workmanship of God's hands is not to be adored, no not in honour of that God that made it ; much less may we adore the workmanship of man, in honour of those persons whose images they are said to be." Declaring, "this, should it be done by Christians, would rather look like changing, than leaving of their idols."

And, lastly, since they solemnly profess, that "by reason of this precept, they had rather die than worship any graven image," with many other like expressions ; it is upon all these accounts extremely evident, that then they had no images of saints erected or painted in the house of God ; and that when they were once admitted, they neither paid to them any outward worship, nor did they think it lawful so to do.

CHAP. IV.

The Fathers forbid Christians to make or worship images and pictures, §. 1. 2ndly, Some of them represent it as a vain thing to desire them, §. 2. 3rdly, When they saw them in churches they tore and pulled them down, as being contrary to Scripture and religion, §. 3. 4thly, When it was objected to them by the Donatists, that some of them placed images on the altar, they reject the calumny with great abhorrence, §. 4. 5thly, When the worship of images was objected to them by the Manichæans, they say, this was done only by some rude people by the Church condemned, §. 5. From the eighth to the fifteenth century, the veneration of images was rejected by the most eminent persons of the Western Church, §. 6.

§. 1. AND suitably to these declarations we find the Fathers, as occasion served, either forbidding of the people to make, or at the least to worship images, and shewing of their zeal against them that did so both in word and action.

Epiphanius speaks thus to the Christians of his time ; “ Attend to yourselves, and remember that you bring not images into the church, or into the dormitories of the saints, nor yet into your common houses ; for it is not lawful for a Christian to wander after them with his eyes.”* “ Picture not Christ,” saith Asterius, bishop of Amasa, “ but bearing him in thy soul, carry the incorporeal Word in thy mind.”† The Council of Eliberis decrees, “ that pictures should not be in the church ;”‡ not because in times of persecution they may be abused by heathens, as Baronius ; nor because they haply may be defaced by the moisture of the walls, as others descant on that canon ; but, “ lest that which is worshipped and adored (by Christians) should be painted upon walls.” This canon was made by the orthodox Fathers, saith Agobardus,§ “ to evacuate the superstition of image worshippers.” And whatsoever is the import of it, it manifestly doth forbid the introduction of any image into the church to be adored ; for saying, that “ it is our pleasure,” or our judgment, “ that images ought not to be in churches,” it must by consequence forbid the giving any adoration to them, since what we must not have, we cannot worship ; and what we are forbid to have, to that we are forbid to exercise those actions which presuppose the having of it. It also doth apparently forbid the introducing the image of our blessed Lord and Saviour, and painting that on the church walls, for he was surely adored and worshipped by Christians ; and that this is indeed the meaning of the canon, will be very probable, if we consider, that about that time some superstitious people, in imitation of the heathens, who were accustomed to paint within their temples,|| the images of those gods they worshipped, began to paint upon the walls of churches the Gospel parables,¶ viz.

* Ἐν τούτῳ μνήμην ἔχετε τοῦ μὴ ἀναφέρειν εἰκόνας ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳς. — οὐκ ἔξεστι γὰρ Χριστιανῷ δι’ ὀφθαλμῶν μετεωρίζεσθαι. 2 Nic. Conc. Act. 6. [ut supra,] p. 473.

† Μὴ γράφει Χριστὸν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς σου βαστάζων νοητῶς τὸν ἀσώματον λόγον περιφέρει. Hom. de Div. et Laz. p. 565.

‡ Placuit in Ecclesiis picturas esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. Can. 36. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 974. Lut. Par. 1671.]

§ Ob hujusmodi evacuandam superstitionem. De Imag. [ut supra,] p. 266.

|| Bochart. de l’Orig. des Images des Saints. p. 598, 599. [Saum. 1656.]

¶ Euseb. de Vit. Const. l. 3. c. 48. [p. 507. Par. 1659.]

our Lord carrying a sheep upon his shoulder,* to represent the parable of the lost sheep; the Gospel histories, as our Lord in the form of a lamb, with the Forerunner pointing to him. Which picture was afterwards approved of by the sixth Synod, though the Council of Eliberis thought it not fit thus to paint what was by Christians worshipped.

§. 2. And suitable to these declarations of their judgment, and these exhortations, hath been the practice of the most learned Fathers of the Church. "Even to the days of Jerome," saith Erasmus,† "men of approved religion would not suffer any painted, carved, graven image, no not of Christ himself." And therefore when Constantia, the sister of the Emperor Constantine, being in Palestine, desired Eusebius to send her the picture of our Saviour Christ: to this request Eusebius returns this answer: "What image is it you would have? that of his Divinity? This I suppose you did not ask for, since no one knows the Father but the Son, and no man knows the Son but the Father: or is it the image of his human nature, that servile form, which, for our sakes, he took upon him? This certainly is that whose image you desire; but we have learned, this is now tempered with the glory of the Godhead; and that this mortal is swallowed up of life. And if his disciples in the Mount were not sufficient to endure the lustre of it, when transfigured, who shall be able to express the splendour of his glorious body in dead and senseless colours and adumbrations, now that putting off corruption and mortality, the similitude of the form of a servant, is changed into the glory of the Lord?"‡ Whence it is evident, he judged Christ's human nature was not then to be painted, or

* Ἀμνὸς δακτύλῳ τοῦ προδρόμου δεικνύμενος ἐγχαράττεται. Conc. Nic. 2. [ut supra.] p. 121. Concil. Trull. Can. 82. [Can. 83.] [Balsam. Can. Sanct. Apost. etc. p. 459. Par. 1620.]

† Usque ad ætatem Hieronymi erant probatæ religionis viri, qui in templis nullam ferebant imaginem, ne Christi quidem. Vol. 5. Symbol. Catech. p. 989.

‡ Τίνα λέγεις καὶ ποίαν ταύτην ἦν φῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα; πότερον τὸν ἀληθῆ, καὶ ἀμεγάλλакτον, καὶ φύσει τοῦς αὐτοῦ χαρακτῆρας φέρουσαν, ἢ ταύτην ἦν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνείληφε τῆς δούλου μορφῆς περιθέμενος τὸ σχῆμα; ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῆς Θεοῦ μορφῆς οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἡγοῦμαι σε ζητεῖν ἕπαξ πρὸς αὐτοῦ πεπαιδευμένην ὅτι οὔτε τὸν πατέρα τις ἐγνω, etc. ἀλλὰ πάντως πού τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς ἐπιζητεῖς τὴν εἰκόνα, καὶ οὐ δι' ἡμᾶς περιεβλήθη σαρκίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Θεότητος ἀνακεκρᾶσθαι μεμαθήκαμεν—Τίς οὖν τῆς τοιαύτης ἀξίας τε καὶ δόξης τὰς ἀποστιλβούσας καὶ ἀποστραπτούσας μαρμαρυγὰς οἷός τε ἂν ᾖ καταχαράξαι, νεκροῖς, ἀψύχοις, χρώ-

represented to the eye, and therefore knew of no such custom then approved by the Church. For had such images then been common in all churches, and all private oratories; had they then been received by all Christians, "from one end of the world to the other," as the second Nicene Council saith, why did Constantia send as far as Palestine for what was every where to be had? Or, why should Eusebius refuse to satisfy her in a request so reasonable? Why doth he put her off with an excuse, which was as opposite to the opinion of the Church of Christ confirmed, saith that Council, by their daily practice, as it was opposite to her request?

Olympiodorus being to build a church in honour of Christ and of the martyrs, writes to Nilus, a celebrated monk, and a disciple of St. Chrysostom, to know whether he should set up any images of them in the choir or sanctuary; or any other images in the house of God, "for the gratification of the eyes of the beholders." To this request Nilus returns this answer, that "it was a very childish business to cause the eyes of the faithful to wander after the aforesaid things; and that it was the indication of a strong and manly apprehension, to have in the sanctuary only one cross framed; that the church might be filled indeed with histories of the Old and New Testament, done by the hand of an excellent painter, that they who could not read the Scriptures, might, by the sight of these pictures, have the memory of the courageous actions of the servants of God, and might be provoked to an emulation of their glorious actions."* So that he clearly shews, that then no pictures were allowed in churches but for historical uses; that no images of Christ, or of the martyrs, were thought fit to be placed in the choir; that the use of them, to gratify the eyes, was childish, and not suitable to men of strong and manlike understandings.

§. 3. Thus matters stood in the middle of the fifth century, but in the fourth it was thought opposite to Scripture and religion to admit images into the Christian churches: witness the epistle of Epiphanius to John, bishop of Jerusalem;

μασι καὶ σκιογραφίαις, ὁπότε μὴδὲ προσβλέψαι αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου οἱ θεσπέσιοι ὑπέμειναν μαθηταί, &c. Apud 2 Nic. Conc. Act. 6. [ut supra,] p. 494, 496.

* Εἰκόνας ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῷ ιερατεῖῳ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Conc. Nic. 2 Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 228. Νηπιῶδες ἂν εἴη καὶ βρεφοπρεπὲς τὸ τοῖς προλεχθεῖσι περιπλανῆσαι τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τῶν πιστῶν. Ibid.

where he saith : “ when I was come into the village called Anablatha, and entering into the church to pray, found there a vail, dyed and painted, and having the image, as it were, of Christ, or of some saint, for I do not well remember whose image it was. But seeing this, that contrary to the authority of Scripture, the image of a man was hanged up in the Church of Christ ; I rent it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the place, that they should rather wrap up and bury some dead body in it.” They murmuring, said, “ that having rent this, he should send them another : which, saith he, I promised, and have now sent ; and I desire you to bid the presbyters of the place receive it of the bearer ; and henceforth to command them, that such vails as these, which are repugnant to our religion, should not be hung up in the Church of Christ ; for it becomes you to be the more careful, for the taking away that scrupulosity which is unworthy of the Church of Christ, and of the people committed to your charge.”* This epistle is extant in the works of Jerome,† both manuscript and printed. It is owned as genuine by Sirmondus and Petavius.‡ It was long since cited against image-worship by the Councils of Frankfort§ and Paris;|| and so the truth of it cannot be reasonably disputed. This being thus premised, I observe,

1. That he declares it “ contrary to the authority of Scripture to hang up in the Church of Christ the image of a man :” he doth not say the image of a wicked man, but simply and without all distinction, *imaginem hominis*, the image of a man.

* Quando venissem ad Ecclesiam, quæ dicitur Anablatha, inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus Ecclesiæ tinctum atque depictum, et habens Imaginem, quasi Christi vel Sancti cujusdam ; non enim satis memini cujus Imago fuerit : cum ergo hoc vidissem in Ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere Imaginem, scidi illud et magis dedi consilium custodibus ejus loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvoluerent, et efferrent ; illique contra murmurantes, dixerunt, si scindere voluerat, justum erat ut aliud daret velum, atque mutaret ; quod cum audissem, me daturum esse pollicitus sum, et illico esse missurum. — Nunc autem misi quod potui reperire, et precor ut jubeas Presbyteros ejusdem loci suscipere a latore, et deinceps præcipere, in Ecclesia Christi istiusmodi vela, quæ contra Religionem nostram veniunt, non appendi. Decet enim honestatem tuam hanc magis habere sollicitudinem, ut scrupulositatem tollat, quæ indigna est Ecclesia Christi, et populis qui tibi crediti sunt. Apud Hieron. Epist. tom. 2. F. 58. [Ep. 51. vol. 1. p. 251. Veron. 1734.] † Ep. tom. 2. p. 58.

‡ In Concil. Narbon. p. 616. [Par. 1629.]

§ Lib. Car. l. 4. c. 25. [ut supra, p. 63.]

|| Synod. Paris. c. 6. [c. 7.] [ut supra, p. 40.]

2. He clearly doth insinuate, that, for any thing he knew to the contrary, the image which he rent was the image of Christ, or of some saint; for "whether it was so or no," saith he, "I do not well remember:" whence evident it is, that had it been the image of Christ, or any of his saints, he would have rent it. He therefore did not think, that to destroy those images which were erected for his worship, was to offer a most vile affront unto his Saviour, as afterwards the second Nicene Council did, and now the Papists do conceive.

3. He positively declares, "that all such vails so hung up in the church, were contrary to the religion of Christians."

4. He desires the bishop of Jerusalem to charge his presbyters, that they should "suffer no such thing hereafter to be done," *i.e.* no painted images to be hung up in the Church of Christ, and that because "it was unworthy of the Church of Christ, and the people committed to his charge," to be scrupulous or concerned about such trifles.

5. Observe; that when he rent this vail and counselled the men of Anablatha, "to wrap and bury some poor body in it," they did not say, for ought appears, and he did not regard it if they said so, that this was to profane the sacred image, or that he offered an affront to Christ, or to his saints, by rending of it; but they say only this, "that having rent that, he should provide another:" whence it is evident, that they had then no custom or doctrine of the Church, which could maintain the hanging up, or could condemn the rending of this vail.

§. 4. The aversion which all good Christians had to images, was so well known to the enemies of the Church, that they made their advantage of it, to withdraw her subjects from communion with her. For the Donatists well knowing how detestable a thing it was unto the Christians of that time, to see an image set up in the Church, and more especially upon the altar, they framed this calumny, the more effectually to draw them off from her communion; "that the Catholics, Paulus and Macarius, would bring an image, and place it on the altar whilst the sacrifice was offered."* This rumour startled the

* Dicebatur illo tempore venturum esse Paulum et Macarium, qui interessent Sacrificio, ut cum Altaria solenniter aptarentur, proferrent illi Imaginem, quam primo in Altari ponerent. Sic Sacrificium offerretur. Hoc cum acciperent, aures et animi percussi sunt, ut omnis qui hæc audierat diceret, qui inde gustat, de sacro gustat. Optat. l. 3. p. 75. [p. 69. Lut. Par. 1702.]

faithful ; “for when the fame of it was spread abroad, the ears and minds of all men,” saith Optatus, “were much troubled at it;” and all that heard it, began thus to speak, “whosoever tastes of any thing from thence, doth taste of a forbidden thing.”

Whence we with Masius, a learned Romanist,* observe how much the ancient Christians did detest the sight of any image on the altar ; that is, how much they did detest the present practice of the whole Church of Rome.

2ndly, Observe the answer of the Christians of those times unto this calumny. They do not say, true it is, we do set pictures upon our altars, and that not only for ornament and memory, but for veneration also ; and we do well to do so, and suitably to the tradition of the Church of Christ ; so that you ought not to be troubled at it, or frightened from our communion by it ; which is the only answer the Church of Rome can make to this objection, and which the Fathers of that age would have made, had they then practised as the Church of Rome doth now ; but they do utterly deny the thing, rejecting it with detestation and abhorrence. Optatus doth confess, that† had the thing been true, the separation of the Donatists would have been just ; that the use of images would have been “a pollution of divine service, and a thing alien from the custom of the Church, and which the eyes of Christians could not have beheld without horror :” clearly condemning by this answer, the practice of the Church of Rome, and justifying the separation of Protestants from her communion, had it been only made on this account.

You have already seen, from the testimony of Nilus, that in the East they admitted nothing in the sanctuary, but the cross, and in particular, no image. In the West likewise, the placing of an image on the altar was forbidden in the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries.

Regino cites a constitution of a Council held at Rheims ; in which it is commanded,‡ “that nothing shall be placed upon

* Masius in Josh. cap. 8. ver. 31.

† Et recte dictum erat, si talem famam similis veritas sequeretur ; at ubi ventum est a supradictis, nihil tale visum est, nihil viderunt oculi Christiani quod horrerent—visa est puritas, et ritu solito solennis consuetudo perspecta est, cum viderent divinis Sacrificiis nec mutatum quicquam nec additum. Ibid.

‡ Nihilque super eo ponatur, nisi ~~ap~~se cum sanctorum Reliquiis, et quatuor Evangelia. De Disc. Eccles. l. 1. cap. 60. [p. 52. Lips. 1840.]

the altar, but a chest containing the relics of the saints, and the four Evangelists. And this constitution seemeth to forbid the placing images on the altar," saith Baluzius upon that canon: "and this," saith he, "seems also to have been the sentence of the French Council held at Tours," A. D. 567. And therefore in the old form of Synodal Admonitions, which was read in churches by the deacon after the Gospel: one admonition is this; "that nothing shall be placed on the altar, but the chests and relics, or perhaps the four Gospels, or the pyx, with the body of the Lord for the viaticum of the sick."* But in the two new forms of admonition published by Baluzius, the last of which is used at present in the Romish Church, the admonition runs in these words; "let nothing be placed upon the altar, but relics, and things sacred and fit for the sacrifice."† The introduction of images upon the altar, making it necessary to make this alteration in their admonition. Even in like manner as the defalcation of the cup in the 14th and 15th centuries, made it necessary to change the old form of admonition, in which they warned all the faithful "to come to the communion of the body and blood of Christ, at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday,‡ into that now extant in the new, and only inviting them "to come to the communion of the body of Christ."§ By which, and by an hundred instances of a like nature, we may learn how impossible it is for them, who have made that the present practice of their Church, which was forbidden by, and was detestable to their forefathers to innovate in any matter, or alter the received customs of the church; and what a goodly argument is brought from the present customs, traditions, doctrines of the people of that Church, to prove they always held the same doctrines, and practised the same religious rites.

§. 5. Moreover, when images began to be admitted into the churches, and by some superstitious people to be adored, the Fathers of the Church, both by their words and actions, shewed their dislike and abhorrence of it. It was the custom

* Nihil ponatur, nisi capsæ et reliquiæ, aut forte quatuor Evangelia, aut pyxis cum corpore Domini. Adm. Antiq. apud. Baluz. Ibid. p. 603.

† Et desuper nihil ponatur nisi reliquiæ, ac res sacræ, et pro Sacrificio opportunæ. Adm. Nov. p. 607, 611.

‡ Omnes fideles ad communionem corporis et sanguinis Domini accedere admonere. Adm. Antiq. p. 605.

§ Omnes fideles ad communionem corporis Domini nostri invitare. Admon. Nov. p. 609. Admon. p. 613.

of some Christians to pay some outward civil worship unto the images of their Christian emperors, till they themselves forbade it. This Jerome taking notice of, doth plainly, in his comment on the prophet Daniel, condemn and reprehend, saying, "whether we call it a statue, or a golden image, the worshippers of God ought not to adore it;* let the judges and princes of the age, who adore the statues and images of the emperors, understand, that they do that which the Three Children refusing to do, pleased God. And here the propriety of the words is to be noted; they say, that gods are to be worshipped, the image to be adored; neither of which is to be done by any servant of God."

When the Manichees, upon occasion ministered by some rude and superstitious people, had charged some Christian churches with image-worship, St. Austin, writing of the manners of the catholic Church against them, directly severs the case of those rude persons from the approved practice of the catholics. "Do not,"† saith he, "mention to me such professors of the name of Christ, as either know not, or keep not the force of their profession; nor the companies of rude men, which either in the true religion itself are superstitious, or so given to their lusts, as that they have forgotten what they promised to God." Then as an instance of those superstitious persons, he adds, that "he himself did know many who were worshippers of tombs and pictures: but how vain, how hurtful, how sacrilegious these men are, I have purposed to shew in another treatise. Now this do I admonish you, Manichæans, that you cease to speak evil of the catholic Church, by upbraiding it with the manners of those men whom she herself condemneth, and seeketh every day to correct as naughty children."‡ These things St. Austin speaks of

* *Cultores Dei eam adorare non debent; ergo Judices et Principes seculi, qui imperatorum statuas adorant et imagines, hoc se facere intelligant, quod tres pueri facere nolentes placuerunt Deo: et notanda proprietas, Deos coli, imaginem adorari, dicunt; quod utrumque servis Dei non convenit. In Dan. 3. p. 256. [vol. 5. p. 638. Veron. 1736.]*

† *Nolite mihi colligere professores nominis Christiani, nec professionis sue vim aut scientes, aut exhibentes, nolite consecrari turbas imperitorum, qui vel in ipsa vera religione superstitiosi sunt. De Morib. Eccl. Cath. c. 34. [vol. 1. p. 713. Par. 1679.]*

‡ *Novi multos esse sepulchrorum et picturarum adoratores. Ibid. Nunc vos illud admoneo, ut aliquando Ecclesie Catholice maledicere desinat, vituperando mores hominum, quos et ipsa condemnat, et quos quotidie tanquam malos filios corrigere studet. Ibid.*

those who were professors of the name of Christ, and children of the Church. They therefore cannot be supposed worshippers of heathen idols, such heathenish persons being never owned as Christians by the Church of Christ, but still rejected as her enemies, and publicly condemned by many of her canons and decrees. Nor doth St. Austin say, these persons worshipped pictures with divine worship, or that they esteemed them as gods. Had he conceived this to have been their crime, he would not have said, that in the true religion they were superstitious, but rather that they were mere heathenish idolators: the second Nicene Council* having told us, that never any Christian man did give *latria* to an image. Nor can it reasonably be conceived that many who professed the name of Christ should be such sots as to believe an image made by their own hands, could be the Great Creator of the world, the Maker of the very man that made it, and of that very metal which composed it.

Moreover, St. Austin here requires the Manichees, not to upbraid the Church of Christ with the practice of these naughty children, whom he calls worshippers of pictures, they being only a rude multitude of superstitious people; of such as either did not know, or did not answer their profession; such as the Church condemned, and still endeavoured to correct. Had then St. Austin, and all good Christians of his age been themselves worshippers of pictures; had he believed that the doctrine and tradition of the Church of Christ required all good Christians to give them honorary worship; would he so generally, without distinction or exception, have condemned all worshippers of pictures as superstitious, rude, and ignorant of what Christianity required? Would he so fully have declared that the Church of Christ condemned, and did endeavour to correct them for it? Would he have charged the Manichees with great injustice; for imputing picture-worship to the Church of Christ, and not have given some of those limitations and distinctions with which the second Nicene Council, and the Romish doctors do so much abound, to put a difference betwixt the avowed and constant practice of the Church, and what both he and she condemned in these worshippers of pictures? St. Austin therefore must be a very dolt, or else must here demonstrate that the Church of Christ did, in his time, con-

* Οὐδεὶς τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν Χριστιανῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰκόνα ἐλάτρευσεν. Act. 6. [ut supra,] p. 417.

ceive all picture-worship to be superstitious, and opposite to the profession of Christianity; and that which she condemned, and did endeavour to correct in those that practised it.

§. 6. And as those Fathers so expressly declared against the doctrine of the second Nicene Council, before they had decreed it; so afterwards, from the eighth to the fifteenth century, it was expressly contradicted and rejected by the most eminent persons of the Western Church.

In the same century it was condemned by the Council of Frankfort,* consisting of three hundred bishops, as hath been shewn already.

It was condemned in the same century not only by Albinus, or Alcuinus, tutor to Charles the Great, and scholar of venerable Bede, who wrote a book against the second Nicene Council, and that assertion of it, that images† ought to be adored, confuting it from holy Scripture: but also by the princes and bishops of the Church of England, in whose name that book was sent to Charles the Great.

It was condemned in the ninth century by the Council held at Paris, A.D. 824. It was in the same century declared to be falsely called a Synod,‡ because it decreed for image-worship, by Hincmarus Rhemensis, by Ado Viennensis, and by Regino Abbas Prumiensis.

It was condemned also by Agobardus, bishop of Lyons, who was made bishop by the consent of the whole clergy of that nation; for in his book, yet extant against this image-worship, he declares amongst many other things already cited from him, thus: "Let no man deceive, let no man seduce, or circumvent himself. Whosoever adores any picture, any molten or graven statue, he doth not worship God, or honour angels or holy men, but he venerates idols."§ And yet Baluzius|| and Sir-

* A.D. 794.

† Contra quod scripsit Albinus epistolam, ex autoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter dictatam, illamque—in persona episcoporum et principum nostrorum, regi Francorum attulit. Hoved. Ann. part. 1. F. 232. B.

‡ Pseudo-Synodus. L. contr. Hincmar. Laudan. c. 20. [p. 93. Lut. Par. 1615.] Chron. ab A. 792. ad An. 794.

§ Nemo se fallat,—quicumque aliquam picturam, vel fusilem, sive ductilem adorat statuam, non exhibet cultum Deo, non honorat Angelos, vel homines sanctos, sed simulacra veneratur. Sect. 31.

|| Ego crediderim Agobardum scripsisse, quod omnes tum in Gallia, ut etiam a Sirmondo observatum est, sentiebant. Bal. Not. in Agob. [ut supra, vol. 2.] p. 88.

mondus do ingenuously confess that Agobardus hath writ only that which the whole Church of France did then acknowledge. Papirius Massonus, who abridged him, saith, "That he did manifestly detect the errors of the Greeks, (*i.e.* the Nicene Council) concerning images and pictures, denying that they were to be adored; which doctrine all we Catholics approve, and follow the testimony of Gregory the Great concerning them,"* which, as you have seen, was this, that images were neither to be broken, nor yet adored.

"The German and French churches,"† saith Cassander, "after the Council held at Frankfort, most constantly continued for some ages in that sentence which they received from the Church of Rome," *viz.* that images were neither to be broken, nor yet to be worshipped. If for *some ages* they must assuredly continue in it till the eleventh century; and that they did so, is evident from the Chronicle of Hermannus Contractus, who styles the second Nicene Council a false Synod, on the forementioned account. *Chron. ad A.D. 794.*

That the Germans continued of the same mind in the twelfth century, is evident from the plain words of Nicetas Coniates,‡ who saith, "that then among the Almain and Armenians, the worship of holy images was equally forbid."

That the French Church was still of the same mind, is evident from the continuator of Aimoinus,§ who plainly saith, that "the Fathers of the Nicene Synod otherwise decreed concerning image-worship than the orthodox doctors had before defined." And from the collection of decrees made by Ivo, bishop of Chartres, who declares the judgment of the Council of Eliberis to be this, "that pictures|| ought not be worshipped, but that they only ought to be memorials of what is worshipped," and cites the passage of Pope Gregory to that effect.

In the same century, Simon Dunelmensis, an Oxonian doctor, and Roger Hoveden their professor, both assert, that in

* *Græcorum errores de imaginibus et picturis manifestissime detegens, negat eas adorari, quam sententiam omnes Catholici probamus, etc. Prefat.*

† *Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ et Germanicæ in hac sententia constantissime aliquot seculis perduraverunt. Cap. de Imag. p. 173. [Consultat. p. 977. Par. 1616.]*

‡ *Quippe apud Alemannos et Armenios S. Imaginum adoratio æque interdicta est. L. 2. de Imp. Aug. Angel. p. 199. In qua Synodo de Imaginibus adorandis, aliter quam Orthodoxi patres antea diffinierant, statuerunt.*

§ *De gestis Francorum, l. 5. c. 28. [p. 320, Par. 1603.]*

|| *Picturas in Ecclesia non esse adorandas. Decret. part. 3. c. 40, 41.*

the second "Nicene* Synod were many things contained, which were inconvenient and contrary to the true faith; and that in the said Council was established a decree that images should be worshipped; which thing the Church of God wholly abhors." And here let it be noted that in these writers we find not the least hint of a distinction between due and undue worship of a holy image; or betwixt worship which the Church of Christ allows, and which the Church abhors; but *imagines adorari debere*, that "images should be worshipped," is declared to be the doctrine which God's Church abhorred.

In the fourteenth century, Robert Holcot, professor in Oxford, most plainly asserts, that "no adoration is to be given to any image; nor is it lawful for any man to worship images."† And Matthew of Westminster condemned the decree of the second Nicene Council, as Hoveden had done before him. *Ad* A.D. 793.

In the fifteenth century, Gerson,‡ Chancellor of Paris, saith, "We do not worship images, and that they are forbidden to be worshipped; that the second commandment forbids us to bow the body or the knee to them, or to worship them with the affection of the mind."

And Gabriel Biel, an Oxonian doctor, teacheth, that then "some of their doctors held, that any image is not to be worshipped, either for itself, as it is wood or stone, nor yet considered as a sign or image."§ And that "the Christian faith

* In quo, proh dolor! multa inconvenientia et veræ Fidei contraria reperiebantur, maxime quod pene omnium orientalium doctorum unanimi assertione confirmatum fuerit; imagines adorari debere, quod omnino ecclesia Dei execratur. Hoved. Ibid. Dunelm. ad A. 793.

† Ideo aliter potest dici, quod nulla adoratio debetur Imagini, nec licet aliquam Imaginem adorare.—Quia autem propter Imaginem Christi excitamur ad adorandum Christum, et coram Imagine adorationem nostram facimus Christo; ergo dicitur large loquendo, N. B. quod Imaginem adoramus. In Eccles. Lect. 158. c. 13. Vide Reliqua.

‡ Omnino prohibentur fieri ad hunc, viz finem, ut adorentur et colantur; unde sequitur neque adores, neque colas ea; ad adorandum igitur et colendum prohibentur Imagines fieri. Sequitur non adorabis neque coles; inter quæ sic distingue, non adorabis, sc. veneratione corporis, ut inclinando eis vel genu-flectendo; neque coles, sc. affectione mentis. Comp. Theol. in Explic. 1. præcepti. tom. 2. p. 25. [par. 2. p. 53. Par. 1606.]

§ Quod vero Christiana religio Imagines sustinet in Ecclesia, et Orationis, non permittit eo fine, ut adorentur ipsæ, sed ut fidelium mentes per earum inspectiones excitentur ad reverentiam et honorem exhibendum his quorum sunt Imagines, in quorum cognitionem recordativam ducunt. Et hic modus dicendi videtur esse Rob. Holcot, super illud Sapientiæ, In-

permits them to be reserved in the Church, not that they may be worshipped, but that the minds of men may be excited to give reverence to them whose images they are ; and that this they said according to Pope Gregory.

In the sixteenth century, Ferus,* a learned preacher at Mentz, saith that " Images are tolerated in the Church, that they may admonish, not that they may be worshipped ; for otherwise they can admit of no excuse."

Yea, a Council held at Mentz, A.D. 1549,† during the session of the Trent Council, speaks thus : " Let our pastors accurately teach the people, that images are not propounded to be worshipped or adored, but that by them we may be brought to the remembrance of those things which we ought profitably to call to mind."

CHAP. V.

Against this pretended tradition of the second Nicene Council, it is farther argued, 1. Because the Jews, though zealous for the observance of the law of Moses, and generally believing that it forbade the having, and much more the bowing to an image, did never, for the five first centuries condemn the Christians for this practice, as afterwards when images began to be received into churches, and adored, they always did, §. 1. 2ndly, Because the Apostles, and succeeding Fathers, who answer all the other scruples of the Jews against the Christian faith, speak not one word in answer to this great objection, that it allowed of image-worship in opposition to the second commandment, §. 2. 3rdly, Because the evidence of truth hath forced many learned writers of the Romish Church to confess, that the Primitive Church had no images, or did not adore them,

felices sunt—mihi videtur dicendum, quod neque adoro Imaginem Christi quia lignum, nec quia Imago ; sed adoro Christum coram Imagine Christi, quia scilicet Imago Christi excitat me ad amandum Christum ; hic modus loquendi originem videtur trahere ex dicto quodam B. Gregorii Sereno episcopo, etc. Et quidem, quia eos adorare vetuisses omnino laudamus, fregisse vero reprehendimus, etc. In Can. Miss. Lect. 49. F. 127.

* Imagines in Ecclesia ideo tolerantur ut admoneant, non ut colantur, alioquin omnino excusari possunt minime. In Act. Apost. cap. 7. p. 94.

† Can. 14. [cap. 41.] [ut supra, vol. 14. p. 681.]

§. 3. *From this Discourse, these four things are inferred ;*
 1. *That the Councils received by the Church of Rome as general, are not infallible interpreters of Scripture, or infallible guides in matters of faith,* §. 4. *2ndly, That the second Nicene Council hath imposed that on Christians, as a tradition of the Church of Christ, which was not so; and therefore was deceived, and did deceive in matter of tradition,* §. 5. *3rdly, That Roman Catholics do vainly boast of the consent of Fathers on their side,* §. 6. *4thly, That the doctrine of the Church of England is much safer in this particular than that of Rome,* §. 7.

MOREOVER, that image-worship was no doctrine delivered to the Church of Christ, either by writing or tradition from the Apostles, that it was not practised in the first ages of the Church, will be apparent from the deportment of the Jews towards the Christians, and the consideration of what they thought of the erection of images in the place of worship, and of the adoration of them.

§. 1. And, (1.) we know that even the believing Jews were zealous for the strict observance of the law of Moses, and were much offended at St. Paul, because they apprehended * “ he taught the Jews to forsake the law of Moses, and not to circumcise their children, or walk after the customs of their fathers.”

We are also informed by Eusebius† and Sulpitius, that this zeal continued among the Jewish Christians for a considerable time after the death of the Apostles, viz. till the destruction of the city by Hadrian. For “ till that time the bishops of Jerusalem were of the circumcision ; and almost all who believed in Christ, did yet observe the law.”

The sect of the Ebionites‡ and Nazarenes continued till the days of Jerome ; they were dispersed throughout the Churches of the East, and were stiff assertors of the obligations of the law of Moses ; and held, § that “ men were to be saved by the observation of it.”

* Acts xxi. 20.

† Tum poene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant. Sulp. l. 2. c. 45. [p. 99. Lugd. Bat. 1643.] Euseb. Chron.

‡ Ep. ad August. contra Faust. [Apud August. contra Faust.] l. 19. c. 18. [August. Op. vol. 8. p. 323. Par. 1688.] Orig. contra Cels. l. 2. p. 56. [vol. 1. p. 385. Par. 1733.] l. 5. p. 272. [Ibid. p. 625.]

§ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 27. [p. 99. Par. 1659.]

2. We know, that in the judgment of the Jews, who lived about our Saviour's time, and after, nothing was more detestable, nothing was more repugnant to the law of Moses, than the admitting of an image in the place of worship, much more the "bowing down to it."

They constantly declared to Pilate, upon occasion of the Roman eagles, that* "they could not permit any image to be placed in their city:" and that† "their law was violated" by the little images of Cæsar annexed to the Roman standards; and that "they would rather die than endure them there." They tell Petronius, that "it could not be permitted to have the image, either of God or man, in their most sacred temple, or elsewhere." They persuade Vitellius not to come thither with them, "because it was not suitable to the laws of their country to see an image brought into it."

And they declared to Herod, son of Antipater,‡ that "whatsoever they endured, they would not suffer the images of men within their city."

3. Certain it is, that for a long time no Samaritan, or Jew, ever objected to the Christians their violation of the second commandment; or at least pretended to be scandalized at their defection from this law of God. No single instance of this nature can be produced from all antiquity, till after the fifth century, when images began to be admitted into churches, provided that they were not worshipped. Then was it that the Jews began to call the Christian churches, upon that account, "*Batte aboda zara*, the houses of idolatry." And from that time they have not ceased to object to them the violation of this law, and to profess that they were scandalized at it.

In the second Nicene Council, Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, confesseth, that§ "upon this account the Jews did often cast reproach upon them; and that the Saracens did the same."

* Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀξιοῦσιν ἐν τῇ πόλει δεικνῆλον τίθεσθαι. Joseph. Halos. l. 2. c. 14. [c. 9. vol. 2. p. 167. Amst. 1726.]

† Ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῶν νόμων Ἰουδαϊκῶν εἰκόνων ποίησιν ἀπαγορεύοντος ἡμῖν τοῦ νόμου. L. 2. c. 8. [Ibid.] l. 18. c. 4. [Archæol. l. 18. c. 3. Ibid. vol. 2. p. 167.] l. 2. c. 17. [Halos. l. 2. c. 10. Ibid. vol. 2. p. 170.]

‡ Εἰ καὶ πάντα δοκεῖεν οἰστά, μὴ φέρειν εἰκόνας ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῇ πόλει. Archæol. l. 18. c. 7. l. 15. c. 17.

§ Οὐ νῦν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις Ἰουδαῖοι τὰ τοιαῦτα ἡμῖν προσηγαγον εἰς οὐκιδισμόν. Act. 4. [ut supra,] p. 300. et p. 240.

Gregory, in his Epistle to him, adds, that* “if any one do accuse this image-worship of idolatry, he is one who calumniates after the manner of the Jews.”

In the fifth action, a Jew is introduced speaking thus:† “I believe in a crucified Jesus, who is the Son of God; but I am scandalized at you Christians, because you worship images; whereas the Scriptures every where command us not to make any graven image or similitude.”

“The Christians are to be reckoned idolaters,” saith R. Kimchi,‡ “because they bow down and adore the image of Jesus of Nazareth.”

Fabianus Flogus,§ a Jewish convert, informs us, that “the Jews dispute after this manner: God, in the Decalogue, writ with his own finger, hath commanded that no kind of image or similitude should be made, &c. but Christians make and worship images, they therefore violate this precept: this,” saith he, “is an undoubted thing among them, and therefore they call the Christians worshippers of idols.”

Joseph, king of Cosri, is said to prefer the Jews before the Christians,|| “because the latter bow themselves to the works of their own hands.”

Had therefore the first Christians received a tradition from the Apostles to adore images, and had all Christians practised suitably to this supposed tradition, both the believing and the unbelieving Jews, being such zealots for the observance of the law of Moses, and professed enemies of images, and of the adoration of them, must have been scandalized at it. We see that they were very much incensed against St. Paul¶ for teaching, “That the Gentiles were not obliged to observe their law;” they would not endure him, unless he also would “walk orderly, and keep the law.” If then St. Paul and St. Peter, as Pope Hadrian** avers; if the rest of the Apostles, as the second Nicene Council saith, had taught and practised this image-worship, so flatly opposite to their law, and therefore execrable to them, this must have stirred up their indignation against St. Paul and Peter much more than their asserting,

* Εἰ τις Ἰουδαϊκῶς κινούμενος — εἰδωλολατρείαν ἐπιγράφει τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. [Ibid.] p. 288.

† Σκανδαλίζομαι δὲ εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὡς Χριστιανοὶ, ὅτι ταῖς εἰκόσι προσκυνεῖτε. [Ibid.] p. 356, 357, 384, 348.

‡ Dr. Pocock, Not. Miscell. p. 322.

§ Catechism. c. 33. p. 68. B.

|| Buxt. Præfat. ad Cosri.

¶ Acts xxi. 20.

** Apud 2. Nic. Conc. [ut supra,] p. 101.

that the ceremonial law did not oblige the Gentiles, could have done.

It is surely difficult to conceive, that they who thought their law so highly violated by framing the picture of a man, or of an eagle, and would rather die than admit of them, because they held they were forbidden by their law, should either, being Christians, continue zealous to assert the obligation of that law, and yet admit the doctrine which did enjoin them both to frame and worship images; or should, continuing unbelieving Jews, never accuse the Christians of a crime so execrable in their sight, nor dissuade any Christian from complying with this great violation of their law.

§. 2. Yea farther, had this practice or tradition obtained in the days of the Apostles, or the five following ages, the Apostles and primitive Fathers would likely have endeavoured to remove this scandal from the Jews, and to return some answer to an objection so very obvious; for their prejudice against image-worship being greater than against any other thing, they had the greatest reason, upon the supposition of such a practice of the Christians, to labour to remove it. And yet we find not that St. Paul, in his Epistles, writ partly to satisfy the Jews, that circumcision was not to be imposed upon the Gentiles; and partly to warn the Gentiles not to bear the yoke of Jewish festivals and ceremonies; or in that purposely designed to teach the Jews, that the priesthood being changed, the ceremonial law must also change together with it; or that St. Peter, or St. James, in their Epistles to the dispersed Jews, take the least notice of so great a prejudice, or spend one word to reconcile the Jew to this supposed image-worship.

Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, G. Nyssen, Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, with many others, have writ on purpose to take off the objections of the Jews against Christianity; and in these writings they have been very diligent in taking off the scandal of the cross, and proving, that the Jewish festivals and sabbaths were abolished; and that their laws concerning circumcision and sacrifices were abrogated; but they spend not one word to shew that Christians were exempted from that precept, which forbade "the bowing down to any image, or similitude;" or to excuse that worship of them they are supposed to have practised, or to declare, as doth the second Nicene Council, that this commandment only forbade the worshipping of idols, or of images

as gods, or to give any other satisfaction to the Jews in this particular.

The Apostles and Fathers do jointly labour to remove the scandal of the cross, and to convince the Jews, that it was reasonable to worship him who was crucified upon it; but they say nothing to remove that which was a greater scandal to them, as the confession of the Jew now mentioned doth assure us, *viz.* "the worship of the cross, and of an image, which was the work of their own hands." They tell the Gentiles, that no man had reason to condemn them for not observing the new moons and Jewish sabbaths, but give them not one item that they had no reason to condemn them for making and adoring images.

The whole New Testament,* which takes especial notice, that the Jews abhorred idols, gives not the least distinction betwixt an image and an idol, nor the least hint of any of those evasions and limitations, by which the Church of Rome now finds it necessary to reconcile her practice to the second commandment; nor of those expositions or retortions used in the second Nicene Council, to refute the clamours of the Jews. Which is a full conviction, that the ancient Church had no such doctrine or practice, which could make it necessary for them to fly unto these Romish shifts and subtleties.

§. 3. To conclude: the suffrage of antiquity is so very clear, the testimonies of it are so numerous, and so convincing, that they have forced many learned persons of the Church of Rome, ingenuously to confess, either that in the primitive Church they had no images, did not regard them, or that they paid no veneration to them, but rather disproved and condemned it.

"The universal Church,"† saith Nicholaus de Clemangis, "being moved by a lawful cause, *viz.* on the account of them who were converted from heathenism to the Christian faith, commanded that no images should be placed in churches."

"The worship of images,‡ not only they who were not of our religion, but, as St. Jerome testifieth, almost all the ancient holy Fathers condemned for fear of idolatry," saith Polydore

* Rom. ii. 22.

† Statuit olim universa Ecclesia, ut nullæ in templis imagines ponerentur. Lib. de Nov. Celebrit. p. 151.

‡ Quem non modo nostræ Religionis expertes, sed teste Hieron. omnes ferme veteres sancti Patres damnabant, ob metum Idololatriæ. De Invent. Rerum, l. 6. c. 13.

Virgil; where the opposition of these holy Fathers to others, not of our religion, and the mention of Pope Gregory among them, shews the vanity of what the Jesuit Fisher saith,* “that Polydore speaks this of the Fathers of the Old Testament, not of the New.”

“This surely I cannot omit,” saith Giraldus, “that as the ancient Romans, so we Christians were without images in that Church which is called Primitive.”†

“The bishops, in these times of persecution,”‡ saith Mendoza, “little thought of images of saints; they abstained from them for a while, lest the heathens should deride them, and should conceive that Christians worshipped them as gods.” All these are witnesses against the second Nicene Council, that the practice was not apostolical, universal, and primitive.

What opinion the Fathers had of this practice, these following persons will inform you.

Petrus Crinitus saith that “Lactantius, Tertullian, and very many others, with too much boldness did affirm that it belonged not to religion to worship any image.”§

“Even to the days of Jerome, who died in the fifth century, men of approved religion,”|| saith Erasmus, “would not suffer any painted, or graven, or woven image, no not of Christ himself.”

“It is certain,”¶ saith Cassander, “that when the Gospel was first preached, there was no use of images for some time among the Christians, as it is evident from Clemens of Alexandria (who flourished at the close of the second), and from Arnobius,” (who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century.)

And again, “How much the ancients, in the beginning of the Church, abhorred all veneration of images, Origen alone, in his book against Celsus, shews.”**

* Apud White, 242.

† Nos dico Christianos, ut aliquando Romanos, fuisse sine Imaginibus in primitiva, quæ vocatur, Ecclesia. Syntagm. l. 1. p. 14.

‡ Sevisimis his temporibus de Sanctorum imaginibus ne cogitarent episcopi—abstinebant ad tempus. De Concil. Eliber. l. 3. c. 5. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 1230. Lut. Par. 1671.]

§ De Hon. Disciplin. l. 9. c. 9.

|| Erasm. vol. 5. Symbol. Catech. p. 989.

¶ Certum est, initio prædicati Evangelii, aliquanto tempore inter Christianos, præsertim in Ecclesiis, Imaginum usum non fuisse. Consult. cap. de Imag. p. 163. [ut supra, p. 974.]

** Quantum veteres initio Ecclesiæ ab omni veneratione Imaginum abhorruerunt, unus Origenes declarat, p. 168. [Ibid. p. 975.]

And a third time, "Truly it is manifest, from the discourse of St. Austin on the cxxiith Psalm, that in his age, the use of carved images or statues was not come into the Church."*

Lastly, he adds, that "in the days of Gregory the Great (that is, in the sixth century), this was the mind and doctrine of the Romish Church, that images should be retained, not to be adored or worshipped; but that the ignorant should by them be admonished of what was done, and be provoked to piety. That the Roman Church did equally condemn the adoration and the breaking of images."†

"That the second Nicene Council, as far as it determined for the adoration of images, was, by the general consent of the Fathers of the Council of Frankfort, condemned and rejected, as being a determination which was repugnant not only to the holy Scriptures and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, but also to the custom of the Roman Church."‡ And, in a word, that "it were to be wished, perhaps, that our predecessors (*viz.* those of the Church of Rome), had continued in that old doctrine of their ancestors;"§ to wit, that images neither should be broken nor adored.

"The corrupt custom, and false religion of the heathens,"|| saith Cornelius Agrippa, "hath infected our religion, and hath introduced into our Church images and idols, and many barren pompous ceremonies, none of which was found or practised among the primitive professors of Christianity."

And now, from what has been discoursed in these chapters, I infer,

Inference 1. §. 4. 1. That the Councils received by the Church of Rome, as the infallible proposers of their faith, namely, the second Nicene Council and that of Trent, have erred, and have imposed a false interpretation of that precept which doth command us "not to bow down to the similitude

* Sane ex Augustino constat, ejus ætate simulacrorum usum in Ecclesiis non fuisse, p. 195. Ibid.

† Quæ fuerit mens et sententia Romanæ Ecclesiæ adhuc ætate Gregorii, satis ex ejus Scriptis manifestum est, viz. ideo haberi Picturas, non quidem ut colantur et adorentur, etc. p. 171. [Ibid. p. 976.] Consuetudo Romanæ Ecclesiæ pariter confractionem et adorationem improbat, p. 171.

‡ Græca illa synodus, qua parte Imagines adorandas censebat, damnata fuit, ut quæ—consuetudini Romanæ Ecclesiæ adversarentur, p. 172.

§ Fortasse optandum esset, ut majores nostri huc usque in prisca illa majorum suorum sententia integre perstitissent, p. 175, 179, 180.

|| De van. Scient. cap. de Imag.

of anything in heaven or earth," and therefore they are falsely said to be infallible in matters of faith or true interpreters of holy Scripture.

And indeed, whosoever seriously will consider of those Scriptures which are produced, either by this whole Council, or by Pope Hadrian, with approbation of this Council, or offered by some members present, or contained in some of the citations produced by them for the having images in Christian churches, or for the giving adoration to them, will find them so apparently perverted and horribly impertinent, as that he will be forced to question not only the infallibility, but even the common wisdom or discretion of those men who had the confidence to use them to these purposes. For,

1. John, the pretended vicar of the three Oriental Patriarchs, saith, that Jacob* "wrestling with him, saw God face to face," which yet can do no service to the maker, or worshipper of images, but by supposing with the old heretic, called *Anthropomorphites*, that God hath face or features like a man.

Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, saith, "If thou accusest me for worshipping the wood of the cross, thou must accuse Jacob for blessing wicked and idolatrous Pharaoh;"† which instance will be only pertinent when it is proved that Pharaoh was an image, and that blessing is an act of adoration.

Pope Gregory II. saith, that "when Moses desired to behold an image or similitude, lest he should be mistaken in the vision, he said to God, Shew me thyself manifestly, that I may see thee,"‡ but this doth not prove that Moses desired to see an image or material likeness of God, or that God shewed him any such similitude.

Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, argues for images after this manner, "In the book of Numbers, the Lord speaks to Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them make themselves fringes in the borders of their garments, and put upon the fringe of the border a ribbon of blue; and it shall be unto you for a fringe, that you may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and do them. Now if,"§ saith he, "the Israelites were bid to look upon these fringes, and remember his commandments; much more ought we, by the inspection of the images of holy men to view the

* Act. 4. [ut supra,] p. 200.

† Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 239, 240.

‡ Cum figuram vellet, aut simulacrum videre, ne forte erraret, orabat Deum dicens, Ostende mihi teipsum manifesto, ut te videam, [Ibid.] p. 11.

§ Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 304.

end of their conversation." And yet there seems to be some little difference betwixt a fringe and a graven image, betwixt remembering God's commandments "to do them," and to break them.

Pope Hadrian finds in Isaiah, a prophecy concerning Gospel-images, as clear as the nose upon your face ; for, *ecce signum* : " In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt ; and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord, and it shall be for a sign."*

He also finds the sweet singer of Israel harping oft upon the same string, and prophesying of images to be adored in the Gospel times ; saying, " The light of thy countenance, *signatum est super nos*, is signed upon us,"† Psalm iv. 6.

And again, " Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house, and the place of the tabernacle of thy glory," Psalm xxvi. 8.

And a third time, " Thy face, Lord, will I seek," Psalm xxvii. 8.

And a fourth, " Even the rich among the people shall entreat thy face," Psalm xlv. 12.

And lastly, in those words, " Honour and majesty are before him ; strength and beauty are in his sanctuary," Psalm xvi. 6.

And what can be more evident for image-worship than these texts, which do so plainly mention the face and countenance of God !

Theodosius proves, that we Christians must have holy and venerable images ; because it is said, " Whatsoever things were written, *ὅσα προεγράφη*, aforetime, were written for our learning ; wherefore the venerable images being written upon wood and stone, and metal, must be for our instruction,"‡ Rom. xv. 4.

Away with those ignorant fellows who can derive the pictures of Christ and his Apostles no higher than St. Luke and Nicodemus ; this Theodosius finds them among the writings of the Prophets, as clear as the noon-day ; see *προεγράφη*, " they were engraven aforetime," even before Christ's human nature, or his Apostles had a being ; and had it not been thus, we Christians had been void of hope, for " these things were written, that we through comfort, *τῶν γραφῶν*, of these pictures might have hope."

* Quemadmodum Esaias propheta vaticinatus est. Act. 2. [Ibid.] p. 110.

† Magnopere vultum ejus secundum humanitatis ipsius dispensationem adorari præmonuit, inquiring, etc.

‡ Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 213.

They have all found it in the book of Canticles, or something which makes for it ; for there it is most appositely said, "Shew me thy face, and let me hear thy voice ; for thy voice is sweet, and thy countenance is comely."* And in that of the Psalmist, "As we have heard, so have we seen," Psalm xlviii. 8.

"Ezekiel's temple was made,"† say they, "with cherubims and palm trees ; so that a palm tree was between a cherub, and a cherub ; and every cherub had two faces ; so that the face of a man was toward a palm tree on the one side, and the face of a young lion toward the palm tree on the other side ; and thus it was throughout the house round about." So that it seemed to them to have been an *ειδωλεϊον*, or a house of imagery ; and yet should you ask them where this temple was built, or what existence had these cherubims, but in the vision of the Prophet, it will puzzle their infallibilities to answer you.

Lastly, They argue from the author to the Hebrews,‡ thus : "Verily the first covenant had also ordinances, and a worldly sanctuary ; there was a tabernacle made, in which was first the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called holy ; and after the second vail, the tabernacle, which is called the holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold ; wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant, and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat. If then," say they, "the Old Testament§ had cherubims shadowing the mercy-seat ; let us have images of Christ, and of his holy mother, shadowing the altar ; for because the Old Testament had such things, the New received them. This," say the Synod,|| "is the truth." "This," say the princes, "is the command of God." But why did they not conclude also for another ark and mercy-seat, another tabernacle, a golden censer, and a pot of manna, seeing it was but saying, as in the case of images they do, "because the Old Testament had these things, let us Christians have them too," and it infallibly must be so ? And tell me now,

* Act. 6. [Ibid.] p. 408. Cant. ii. 14.

† Act. 4. [Ibid. p.] 197.

‡ Ibid.

§ 'Εάν ἡ παλαιὰ εἶχε χερουβείμ, καὶ ἡμῖς εἰκόνας τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν, κατασκευαζούσας τὸ ἱλαστήριον. [Ibid.] p. 200.

|| 'Ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος εἶπεν, ναὶ Δέσποτα ἡ ἀλήθεια· οἱ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ-στατοι ἄρχοντες εἶπον, ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ διαταγὴ ἐστίν. Ibid.

can any one who reads these powerful demonstrations from, and excellent expositions of the holy Scripture, doubt of the truth of that which is so oft asserted by this Synod, that “they were certainly assisted by the Holy Ghost?”*

But to be serious: if all, or any of these places, have any strength to prove that images should be set up in churches, or adored by Christians, why do not any of their writers use them to that end? If they do not, why may not they be taxed with weakness, who use such proofs as none but the most undiscerning persons could produce, and which their best friends are ashamed of?

• Inference 2. §. 5. Hence it is evident that the second Nicene Council grossly was mistaken in that determination and assertion, so frequently repeated in that Council, that image-worship had been delivered to them by the continual suffrage and approbation of the whole Church of Christ; and was the tradition of the whole Church catholic, even from the times of the Apostles.

And consequently, that this Council hath been actually deceived in matter of tradition, as well as in her interpretations of the holy Scripture: for whereas it is frequently there said that this was the constant doctrine and tradition of the holy Fathers of the catholic Church; the opposition is not greater betwixt light and darkness, than betwixt the assertions of the Fathers, and the determinations of the Council. For,

1. The Fathers of that Council do pronounce Anathema† against all persons who take such places of the holy Scripture, which are spoken against idols, as spoken against holy images, i.e. who says the second commandment forbids the worship, not of idols only, but of holy images. And so they do pronounce Anathema against Justin Martyr, St. Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Austin, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Agobardus, the Councils of Constantinople, Frankfort, and Paris.

2ndly, The Fathers of the same Council pronounce Anathema‡ against all persons who say, “that the erection of

* Act. 3. [Ibid.] p. 157. Act. 7. p. 580, 581, 585.

† Τοῖς ἐκλαμβάνουσι τὰς τῆς θείας γραφῆς ῥήσεις, τὰς κατ’ εἰδώλων, εἰς τὰς σεπτὰς εἰκόνας, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 1. [Ibid.] p. 57. 4. p. 317. 5. p. 389. 7. p. 576. 8. p. 592.

‡ Τοῖς λέγουσι διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας ἐφεύρεμα τὴν τῶν εἰκόνων ποίησιν, καὶ μὴ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῖν παράδοσιν, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 1. [Ibid.] p. 57.

images is the invention of the devil, and not the tradition of the catholic Church:" and so they do pronounce Anathema against Clemens of Alexandria, St. Ambrose, Theodotus, Amphilocheus, St. Jerome, and St. Chrysostom, Agobardus, Hincmarus, and the three forementioned Councils; who all declare, "that this was no tradition of the catholic Church." And against Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, Theodotus Ancyranus, and the whole Council of Constantinople, who say expressly, "that image-making or image-worship was the invention of the devil."

3rdly, These Fathers do pronounce Anathema* "to all who violate, break, or dishonour sacred images;" which Epiphanius, Serenus, and all the Fathers of Constantinople did; and "upon all that knowingly communicate with them, who contumeliously speak of them, or dishonour them."

Now seeing all the Christians of the fourth century did certainly communicate with Epiphanius; of the sixth century with Serenus; since all the Fathers mentioned in my second chapter, do in their sense dishonour images, they in effect pronounce Anathema against them all.

4thly, They pronounce Anathema† "against all persons who detract from, or who speak evil of their sacred images."

Now since the Fathers have declared concerning images in general, that they are "worse than mice and worms;" that they are "the invention of the devil;" with many other things of a like nature, mentioned chapter the second; they must be all obnoxious to this Anathema.

5thly, They pronounce Anathema‡ "against all who do not call them holy and sacred images;" that is, against St. Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius, and others, who have declared, that they cannot be sacred; and that they are men of impotent spirits and lame minds, who so esteem them.

6thly, They denounce Anathema§ "against all those who do not worship images, or who doubt of, or who are disaffected to

* Τοῖς εἰκονοκλάταις ἀνάθεμα, τοῖς κοινωνοῦσιν ἐν γνώσει, τοῖς ὑβρίζουσι καὶ ἀτιμάζουσι τὰς σεπτὰς εἰκόνας, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 317. 5. p. 389. 7. p. 576.

† Τοῖς βλασφημοῦσιν εἰς τὰς τιμίας καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 317. 5. p. 389.

‡ Περί τῶν ἱερῶν εἰκόνων πιστούμεθα, καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ ἱεράς, καὶ ἁγίας αὐτὰς ἀποκαλοῦμεν, καὶ ὁ μὴ οὕτως λέγων, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα· ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος εἶπεν, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα. Act. 4. [Ibid.] p. 212.

§ Τοῖς μὴ προσκυνοῦσι τὰς ἁγίας καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 1. [Ibid.] p. 61. 7. p. 584.

the worship of them." Now this Anathema, if what is here produced cannot be refuted, must certainly be pronounced against the blessed Apostles, and all the Christians of the first five centuries.

Lastly; Whereas Origen declares, "that the first thing which Christians taught their converts, was the contempt of all images;" the Fathers of this Synod pronounce Anathema* to all "who do not diligently teach all Christian people to adore the images of all good men from the beginning of the world."

§. 6. 3rdly, Hence also may be seen how vainly and unjustly Roman Catholics do boast of the consent of Fathers on their side, and say, that they expound the Scriptures according to that sense which they received from the ancients; it being evident, from what hath been discoursed, that in their exposition of these words, "Thou shalt not make to thyself the similitude of any thing in heaven or earth, &c. thou shalt not bow down to them," they do embrace a sense which no Father, for the first six centuries, did ever put upon them; and do reject that sense they generally did impose upon these words.

§. 7. 4thly, Hence I infer, that the religion of the Church of England is, in this particular, much safer than that of Rome: for if image-worship be not forbid in this commandment, nevertheless we only do neglect that practice which their best writers deem indifferent;† which no Jew ever did perform to any patriarch or prophet, nor any Christian for 600 years to any apostle, saint, or martyr, and which no Scripture hath commanded; and so we only do neglect to do that, which neither example of the ancients, nor any precept, doth commend to

* Τοῖς μὴ διδάσκουσιν ἐπιμελῶς πάντα τὸν φιλόχριστον λαὸν προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ἀσπάεσθαι τὰς σεπτὰς, καὶ ἱερὰς, καὶ τιμίας εἰκόνας πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος τῷ Θεῷ εὐαρεστησάντων, ἀνάθεμα. Act. 1. [Ibid.] p. 61.

† Illud ante constituendum, Imagines, ex earum per se genere esse quæ ἀδιάφορα nominantur, hoc est, quæ ad salutem omnino necessaria non sunt, nec ad substantiam ipsam religionis attinent, sed in potestate sunt Ecclesiæ, ut ea vel adhibeat, vel abieget pro eo atque satius esse decreverit. Petav. Theol. Dogm. tom. 5. l. 15. cap. 13. sect. 1.

Ea est hujusce miserrimæ dissensionis materia, sine qua, *sicut multis videtur*, salva per fidem, spem, et charitatem incunctanter, et in hoc seculo et in futuro, salvari potest Ecclesia, quorum sensus, et sententia talis est, quid fidei, spei, et charitati obesse potuisset, si Imago nulla toto orbe terrarum picta vel ficta fuisset. Epist. Eugenii, p. 2. Act. Synod. Paris. p. 130, 134.

our practice : whereas if image-worship should be here forbid to us Christians, which, to speak modestly, seems highly probable, the Church of Rome must practise and enjoin that worship which provokes God to jealousy, exhort and force her members to perform that worship, from which God doth exhort them to abstain, "lest they corrupt themselves:" she must enjoin that action upon pain of her displeasure, and of the wrath of God, which he commands us to avoid, "because he is a jealous God;" she must imprison, and cut off by excommunication, and by the sword, Christ's servants, because they will not, by doing that which God so frequently and so directly hath forbid, incur the hazard of his wrath, who saith,* "If ye corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish:" and it is easy to determine which we ought most to fear, the wrath of God or man.

* Deut. iv. 25, 26.

A DISCOURSE
CONCERNING THE
SECOND COUNCIL OF NICE.

WHICH FIRST INTRODUCED AND ESTABLISHED IMAGE-
WORSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, A.D. 787.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

UPON sight of a book lately published, called “The Fallibility of the Roman Church demonstrated from the manifest Error of the Second Nicene and Trent Councils,” &c. I thought the labours of this author might have been thereby prevented: but upon perusal of both, I find them so consistent, that had our author seen that work (as he had not), he would have found no just reason to have laid aside this design, or treated of it in another order than he has observed. For the design of the former is to shew, “that the Church of Rome and her Councils have actually erred, in making the worship of images a tradition of the Apostles, and to have been received by all Christians from the beginning:” and this that author has effectually done by producing the undeniable authorities of the Fathers in this matter from age to age, and shewing the repugnancy between them and the decrees of these Councils. But this book solely applies itself to the second Council of Nice; and after an historical narration of the occasion, and the characters of the persons chiefly concerned in it, doth further, from the acts of it, discover the mistakes, impostures, and falsifications: and how at last it was of no authority, and though received as a General Council by the Church of Rome, doth in many instances notoriously contradict it. But though this book doth not intrench upon the former, but rather with it make one complete book, yet there are some things, which it was not so consistent with this author’s design to enlarge upon, that may be met with in the other. Which, together with the other references, the reader will find for the most part noted in the margin, as he goes along.

THE PREFACE.

THE religious veneration which is now by the Roman Church said to be due to images, cannot be grounded upon Scripture, because it was expressly forbid in the Old Testament, and is not once mentioned in the writings of Christ and his Apostles, who taught all men to worship God in spirit and in truth : nor can it be derived from any universal ecclesiastical tradition, because then (according to Lirinensis' rule) that tradition must have been held in all ages, and in all places, and among all Christians. But the primitive Christians, during the Ten Persecutions, had no images at all in their churches, as appears by the testimony both of heathens and Christians.*
 †The very use of pictures in churches was forbid by a Council in those ages:‡ and five of the first General Councils do not so much as name them. After the Church began to flourish in peace and plenty, we find images and pictures were first used only to adorn the Christian oratories, and to keep in memory some history of Scripture, or some eminent acts of saints and martyrs : but in Pope Gregory's time (that is about 600 years after Christ), some superstitious people began to adore them ; yet still they were reprov'd for so doing by that Pope and by others : however, as ignorance increased, by the irruption of the barbarous nations into Christendom, this superstition increased also, and grew to that height, that the Emperor, by the advice of his bishops in a Council at Constantinople, was forced to take away all pictures and images, to prevent that idolatry which was practised by the vulgar. All this being done without the consent of the Bishop of Rome, he took very ill ; and after this Emperor was dead, and a woman, as tutoress to her infant son, governed the empire ; a layman being hastily advanced to be patriarch at Constantinople, Pope Adrian chooses that lucky juncture to procure a Council to be called for the restoring images in the East. Now lest the great and venerable name of a General Council (as they call this assembly) should impose upon any unwary persons, or give credit to the superstitious adoration of images, which they first established by a law : I have briefly repre-

* Lamprid. in Vit. Alexan. Severi.

† Minut. Felix. p. 92. Lactantius de Morte persec. cap. 12. p. 11. [vol. 1. p. 199. Lut. Par. 1748.]

‡ Concil. Elib. Can. 36. Ann. 303. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. p. 974. Lut. Par. 1671.]

sented this famous Council in its own words and sense, and shewed upon what weak grounds they proceeded to make this establishment: and if I have any where mistaken the meaning of these doctors, it was not by design, but by reason of those many barbarisms in the style, and the frequent obscurity of the sense, which will plead my excuse to all that have read this Council in the original. I could easily have noted more mistakes, and have urged those which are observed more to our adversaries' disadvantage: but we need not multiply instances, when there are a few so full and plain, nor is there any occasion to aggravate those matters, which are exposed by the bare relating of them. It is certain that the most learned, and consequently the most moderate Romanists, are much ashamed of this Council; and many of them wished and endeavoured in the last century for a reformation in this point: but interest prevailed more than arguments, and so this practice was established by a new decree: in obedience to which, the writers of that side are obliged to palliate it as well as they can, and much artifice is used by their great historian, and the editors of their Councils, to make it seem a catholic tradition; but they are so conscious to themselves that it is not so, that they are forced to conceal very many things which would utterly confute that pretence if they did appear. For example, in Labbe's edition of the Councils, that part of the letter of Charles the Great to Offa is left out, wherein he mentions the sending him a copy of this pretended General Council,* and both in Binius's edition and his, the collections of that famous assembly at Paris against images are left out, because (as the notes inform us) they smell of the heresy of the ancient Gallican Church, who would not allow adoration of images. Yet,† after all their policy in suppressing that which makes against them, there is (praised be God) enough extant in Scripture and uncorrupted antiquity, to convince all disinterested men, that the use of images in religious worship, is not only a corruption of the original Christian way of worshipping God, but also a manifest innovation.

* Labbe, Conc. tom. 7. p. 1131.

† Ibid. p. 1585.

CHAP. I.

Of the Occasion and Proceedings of this Council.

THE Christians had continued for three centuries without any images in their places of worship ; and it was in the fourth age, when some began first to adorn churches with the histories of the Gospel, and the passions of the martyrs represented in pictures ; which well-meant and innocent custom gave occasion to some ignorant and superstitious people afterwards to give too great reverence to them. And though many eminent Fathers, and particularly Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, utterly disliked this, and declared these pictures were only placed in churches for memory and history, not to be adored : yet the vulgar proceeded so far toward idolatry, that the very Jews and Saracens were highly scandalized at it ; and divers pious Christian bishops advised the Emperor Leo Isaurus (otherwise called Iconomachus) rather to take both images and pictures out of churches, than to give occasion to superstition and idolatry,* by letting them stand in those sacred places. Whereupon the Emperor writes to Gregory II. then bishop of Rome, to advise with him about calling a General Council on this occasion ;† but the Pope opposed this fair motion, and wrote back an abusive and ill-penned letter, which hindered not the good Emperor (being studious of the church's peace) from writing again ;‡ yet he obtained only a return like the former : which so provoked the Emperor that by the advice of his neighbouring bishops, he proceeds to the other extreme : and orders all pictures and images of Christ and the saints to be pulled down, and defaced ; and with the consent of the ecclesiastics, deposeth Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, who opposed this order ; and placeth Anastasius in his room. Pope Gregory, glad of this occasion to make his terms with the Western Franks, who were nearer and more likely to defend him, and promote all the interests of his See, excommunicates the Eastern emperor Leo Isaurus, as an enemy of the Church, and unworthy of the empire ; and persuades his subjects in Italy to pay him no more tribute, and to renounce his government and authority.§ Not long after this Gregory|| dies, being succeeded

* Anno 726.

† Concil. Gen. &c. editio Lab. p. 18. C.

‡ Vid. Spanhemii Histor. Imag. sect. 2. p. 71, &c.

§ Concil. p. 3. D.

|| An. 731.

by Gregory III. who held the same principles, and carried on the same design: and Leo *Isaurus* dying, his son Constantine VI. commonly called Copronymus, was the successor both to his empire and opinion. For which reason the faction of the Pope's side rebelled against their lawful sovereign, and proclaimed his kinsman Artabasduſ, Emperor, excommunicating Constantine, and fortifying his royal city of Conſtantinople againſt him: but the rightful prince gathering forces, ſet upon theſe rebels by ſea and land, and conquers the city, taking Artabasduſ the uſurper, and many of his complices, whom he puniſhed as their treaſon deſerved; and for that juſtice is called a perſecutor by the partial writers of that hiſtory. But Conſtantine being in peace,† calls a Synod at Conſtantinople;‡ at which were preſent three hundred and thirty-eight biſhops (the chief of which was Theodoſius, biſhop of Ephesus), who by Scripture, antiquity, and reaſon, proved that images and pictures were not to be adored; and excommunicated ſuch as worſhipped them; allowing the defacing of them to prevent idolatry. It is true, the Pope would not confirm thoſe decrees; but neither he nor his party were able to answer the arguments they produced:§ and the Emperor puniſhed ſuch as would not obey the decrees of this Synod, but encouraged the propugners of them. Howbeit, a fever carries off Conſtantine after he had reigned near thirty-five years, who was ſucceeded by his ſon Leo IV. called Porphyrogennetus,|| an enemy alſo to the adoration of images: but he did little in that matter, being prevented by death, after a ſhort reign of five years. The empire then deſcended on his ſon, Conſtantine, a child of ten years old, under the tuition of his mother, the empreſs Irene,¶ a woman ſcarcely to be paralleled for ambition, diſſimulation, and cruelty; and who at laſt deprived this her ſon of ſight, empire, and life.** It is this empreſs, that, after her diſſimulation in the time of Conſtantine, and her huſband Leo, revived the cauſe of image-worſhip. To make way for which, Paul the patriarch, one of great eſteem, muſt reſign hiſ†† charge, (but not with a recantation of his ſubſcription in the former Council, for defacing images, as this of Nicene‡‡ would have

* An. 741.

† An. 754.

‡ Or the Herulan Palace over againſt Conſtantinople, on the Aſian ſhore.

§ V. Spanhem. Hiſt. Imag. ſect. 3. p. 170, 171, &c. || An. 775.

¶ Spanhem. p. 313, &c. ** An. 796. †† Spanhem. p. 326.

‡‡ Act. 1. [Concil. ibid. p. 51.]

it.) And Tarasius, a layman, and secretary to the Emperor, and a creature of the empress's, was advanced into his room. But this crafty person seemingly refuses it, until it was yielded (as before agreed) that a General Council should be called for the adjusting of this matter. This accepted, Adrian the then Pope, and it is said, the other patriarchs, were summoned to attend it. But as to the other three,* it is certain, that if the letters were sent, they were never received; or if received, there were none of them then present in person, nor by their legates. And Adrian excused himself with great submission by letter; but sends, as his deputies, Peter, archbishop of St. Peter's, in Rome, and another Peter, abbot of St. Saba; and the Council was summoned to sit at Constantinople. But when it was perceived that Adrian and the empress designed to restore images, the other party came in great numbers to the place, where the Council was assembled, and forced them to rise and disperse, almost as soon as they were set down. And their zeal was so great, that the bishops durst not meet again of one whole year; and after that they were driven to assemble at Nice in Bithynia, (where the first General Council had been held.) Being thus at last met at Nice, Tarasius, the new-made bishop of Constantinople, with the Pope's legates, and two monks representing the Eastern patriarchs, managed the assembly: and after the reading of the Emperor's letter (before they had proved their opinion intended to be established), in the first action they made divers bishops (who had signed the former Council against images) recant, and so restored them. In the second action they read Pope Adrian and Tarasius's letters for image-worship. In the third action they read Tarasius's letter to the Eastern patriarchs, and their answers. In the fourth and fifth actions they attempted to confirm the adoration of images, by some kind of quotations out of the ancients; and by answering some allegations to the contrary. In the sixth action they read the arguments used by the former Synod at Constantinople against image-worship; and with them the Council's answer to the several paragraphs. In the seventh action they make their decree for adoration of images. In the eighth and last action they make divers canons for ecclesiastical discipline, and write some synodical epistles; and so the Council broke up at Nice, but adjourned to Constantinople,

* Spanhem. p. 362, 372, &c.

where all that had been done was read to the empress and her son, who confirmed their decrees; as did also Pope Adrian afterwards.

Now in the following discourse, we will first examine what kind of persons they were, who first established this doctrine and practice, and then observe what grounds and reasons they went upon; as also what regard was had to their determination in that, and the succeeding ages; which we will dispatch with as much clearness and brevity as the matter will allow.

CHAP. II.

Of the Persons who defended Image-worship, especially in this Council.

THE first patron of this opinion mentioned in the Council is Pope Gregory II. who writ two letters to the emperor Leo Isaurus, which are printed at the beginning of the Acts; and we need no other character of him, than we may select from these letters; wherein he gives us a specimen of his manners in calling the Emperor an unlearned and thick-skulled man,* and upbraids him with his great stupidity;† and yet the Emperor was none of his image-worshippers, whose dull, simple, and gross minds (as this Pope saith) needed such representations to raise them up to the things represented;‡ and history describes him as a prudent and discreet prince. But Pope Gregory himself seems not to abound too much in ingenuity, for he describes a known heretic to be “one that is known to few, and not to many:”§ and he mistakes Bezaleel for one of the tribe of Dan, who was certainly of the tribe of Judah.|| Yea, so little was he versed in Scripture, that he takes Hezekiah, who broke the brazen serpent to pieces, to have been the same man with his great grandfather Uzziah, who would have executed the priest’s office, though he began to reign eighty-four years before Hezekiah.¶ A like instance of his infallibility he gives, in affirming that “David sanctified the brazen serpent, and brought it into the temple:”**

* Concil. tom. vii. p. 10. D. † Ibid. p. 14. C. ‡ Ibid. p. 14. D.

§ Ibid. p. 15. E. || Ibid. p. 11. B. Exod. xxxi. 1, 2.

¶ Ibid. p. 15. A. 2 Chron. xxvi. 16. and 2 Kings xviii. 4.

** Ibid. p. 15. B.

whereas it is well known David was dead before the foundation of the temple was laid. His loyalty also bore proportion to his learning; for he tells us, "he prayed to Christ, that he would send the devil to take the Emperor:"* and this he fancied to be imitating St. Paul, in delivering the incestuous Corinthian to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that his soul might be saved. He argues notably indeed, that "Emperors ought not to meddle with electing clergymen, because bishops ought not to concern themselves with the palace, nor dispose of royal dignities."† Yet the prefacer to the Council tells us, "he deprived the Emperor of the government of Italy:"‡ and Zonaras saith, "he forsook his allegiance to the Emperor, and made a league with the Franks."§ And we may be confident he did not hold the doctrine of non-resistance. For being very angry that the Emperor had ordered an image of Christ to be demolished; which he calls "breaking the Saviour to pieces;|| he challenges him to come to Rome, if he durst, and break the image of St. Peter, which all the Western kingdoms took for an earthly god; threatening him, if he did, he would be revenged on him by his Western friends."¶ If we would know more of this Pope, we may read that ridiculous book of Dialogues, from whence this Gregory was called the Dialogist, which is falsely ascribed to Pope Gregory I.; but the fables are so gross, and the style so mean, that it is far more like to be the work of this patron of images.

As to those bishops who sat in this Council, the Acts do not speak them to have been any great clerks. Tarasius, the patriarch of Constantinople, had lately been a lay-courtier, and yet was the chief orderer (if not the president) of this venerable assembly.** Pope Adrian at first, it seems, thought him unfit to be a bishop; but when he joined with him in image-worship, he then consented to his election.†† Yet they who made him a bishop, could not make him a divine; as appears by his arguing, "that it is the same thing in doctrines to err in a little matter, as a great; for by either of them the law of God is disannulled."‡‡ By which maxim, Papias's thousand years reign, and St. Cyprian's opinion of re-baptizing heretics, would be as great heresies as those of

* Ibid. p. 27. B.

† Ibid. p. 26. D.

‡ Ibid. p. 3. D.

§ Zonar. vita Leon. Isaari.

|| Ibid. p. 19. A.

¶ Ibid. p. 22. A.

** Ibid. p. 35. A.

†† Ibid. Act. 2. p. 118. D.

‡‡ Ibid. Act. 1. p. 78. E.

Arius and Macedonius. And perhaps it was upon this same principle that he elsewhere affirms, "Taking money for ordination, or simony, is as great a heresy as that of Macedonius, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost."* One of their authors, here quoted with applause, hath this sinewy comparison, "Even as he that affronts the Emperor's image, is punished as though he affronted the Emperor, though the image be wood or coloured wax; even so he that dishonours the image of any man, dishonours him whose figure it is,† which is *idem per idem*." That bishop was no deep Rabbi, who being to prove that a man who had sworn to the devil that he would not worship an image, was not obliged to keep his oath, cites Zech. viii. 17: "Ye shall love no false oath;" and thence notably infers, "our false oaths are therefore not to be heeded, being of no force."‡ John, the legate of the Oriental diocese, had but very small skill in the Oriental tongues, or else he would not have erred so very grossly in the etymology of *Israel*, which he says signifies "the mind-seeing God."§ And if the whole Council joined in making that answer to the former Synod against images, they were much overseen in saying, "The blessed Virgin Mary was by nature the mother of God."|| Whereas she confesses, and all men know, it was a high grace and special favour in God to choose her for the mother of his Son: but no doubt they perceived the ignorance of bishops in that age, when they made a canon in this very Council, that "he who was to be promoted to a bishopric, should be very well acquainted with his Psalter, that so he might be able to instruct his clergy in it; and that the metropolitan should strictly examine whether he were sufficient to read the Canons, the Gospel, the Epistles, and the rest of the Scriptures (which were then and there in the vulgar tongue) discreetly and not imperfectly."¶ We cannot doubtless but have a mighty respect for doctrines brought in by these bishops, since our age hath school-boys better qualified; and we cannot but pity those learned men, who are now obliged to defend what mere ignorance then produced.

* Ibid. Act. 8. p. 630. E.

† Ibid. Act. 4. p. 254. E.

‡ Ibid. Act. 6. p. 542. E.

† Ibid. Act. 4. p. 247. E.

§ Ibid. Act. 4. p. 199. D.

¶ Ibid. Act. 8. Can. 2. p. 595. E.

CHAP. III.

Of the falsehood of divers passages in this Council.

THOUGH the want of learning in guides of souls be a great defect, yet want of integrity is a greater; but there are many evidences in this Council, that the bishops there assembled were as void of sincerity and truth, as they were of learning and judgment: for Pope Gregory, in his letter,* and the Council do affirm,† “that they had no hope nor trust in images:” yet when Basilius comes to recant, the Council makes him declare, he “reverently adores the relics of the saints, hoping to be partaker of their sanctification,”‡ and the whole Council saith the same.§ Doubtless also those citizens of Rome mentioned with honour, had some hope in the image of Symeon Stylites, since they are said to have set up this image on every shop-door, seeking protection and safety to themselves: || yea, the Council saith, “we salute and embrace images, hoping to partake of sanctification by them.”¶ Tarasius, the patriarch, declares. they had received images for lifting up their minds, and helping their memories, and for procuring some holiness from them.”** And in the appendix to this Council, it is affirmed, that “Christians, by affectionately adoring and saluting the cross and other images, are made partakers of their sanctification;”†† which shews their pretence to have no hope in them, to be a mere sham, and a downright untruth.

Tarasius saith, “If it be asked why images do no miracles now, as they were wont to do of old, we must grant,” saith he, “that they do none:” and he pretends to give this reason for it, “because that age had no infidels in it,”‡‡ though there were thousands who did not believe images were to be adored; and so needed miracles to convince them. Germanus Isc, his predecessor, almost one hundred years before, speaking of his own time, saith, “We must not admire there are no such miracles now, as were related to have been done by images in former times, lest we should doubt of the miraculous gifts of the Apostles’ days, since no such are now given.”§§ This seems a full confession, that for almost an hundred years

* Ibid. p. 14. E.

† Act. 6. p. 411. B.

‡ Act. p. 55. B.

§ Act. 6. p. 42. E.

|| Act. 4. p. 266. A.

¶ Act. 6 p. 491. B.

** Act. 8. p. 639. B.

†† Ibid. p. 647. B.

‡‡ Act. 4. p. 223. C.

§§ Ibid. p. 315. A.

before this Council no miracles were done by images; and yet in contradiction to this confession, there are innumerable stories told and approved in this Council, of miracles wrought before images; and many of them pretended to be done in, and since the time of Germanus; yea, some of them but a short time before the Council: such as the Sicilian bishop's report of a woman dispossessed by an image at Rome, and the Eastern legato's remark upon it:* and the story of Manzo, a bishop then in the Council, who pretends to have been cured by addresses to an image the very year before,† with that improbable relation of a Hagarene's eye put out by an image, in revenge for his putting out its right eye, said to be done but two years before.‡ Now either the two patriarchs, who grant there were no miracles of this kind in their time, or these relators, must needs speak falsely; but it is more probable the histories told for the credit of images are falsehoods, than the ingenuous confessions of two zealots for them, in a case which lessened their credit; and therefore the Council of Frankfort justly charged them with citing apocryphal stories and ridiculous fables, to justify their error.§ Yet upon the credit of these fictions, they argue for image-worship.

Pope Gregory had bragged in his first letter, "that the six foregoing General Councils had delivered this doctrine of images to them."|| But when the Emperor affirmed he could find nothing in those Councils concerning them, the Pope, in his answer, plainly supposes there is nothing in them about images;¶ and therefore I wonder how he could prove that false assertion of his: "that bishops of old carried images with them to Councils.** In like manner the Council pretends, "the tradition of images did not begin at the sixth General Council, but had been ever since the Apostles' preaching:"†† yet they are so inconsiderate, that without any proof of the Apostles' times, they, in the very next page, cite the eighty-second canon of the sixth Council; which expressly declares, "that in former time Christ was not pictured in human form, but represented by a lamb:" and they ordain, that from thenceforth it should be lawful to picture our Lord in human form, without any mention of adoring that picture of him;‡‡ which testimony (though they triumph very much in it, and

* Act. 4. p. 215. D. & 218. A.

† Ibid. p. 258. D.

‡ Ibid. p. 270. D.

§ Vid. Ep. Adrian. p. 939. D.

|| Ep. 1. Greg. p. 10. D.

¶ Ep. 2. Greg. p. 27. D.

** Ibid. E.

†† Act. 6. p. 403. E.

‡‡ Ibid. p. 406. E. 407. A.

urge it three times) makes really against them, and declares, **that** adoring images of Christ, is so far from being an Apostolical tradition, or a doctrine of all the six General Councils, that till this last of the six (which was not one hundred years before this of Nice) it was not used nor allowed to picture or carve Christ in the form of his humanity.

The Council which forbade the adoration of images, blamed such as worshipped them, for imagining a thing made with hands, to be God, and calling it by the name of Christ.* The Nicene bishops answer this, by saying, "Christians do not call venerable images by the name of God."† But then I would know, what religion Pope Gregory was of, who calls the image of Christ by the name of "the Saviour;"‡ and the Council reckons Severus for a heretic, for saying, "the images of doves hanging over the altar were not to be called the Holy Ghost." Yea, they labour very earnestly to prove, "that the image of Christ agrees with him in name, though not in substance;"§ and affirm, that his image "ought to be called by his name;"|| yea, John, the legate of the Eastern patriarch, openly saith, "he that adores an image of Christ, doth not sin," if he affirm "this is Christ the Son of God."¶ And if this be not calling images by the name of God, I know not what is.

These patrons of images do more than once brag, "that all the bishops and priests of the east and west, north and south, had agreed to anathematize such as opposed image-worship:"** and nothing is so common as for the packed assembly to call themselves the Catholic Church.†† But let it be considered, that not long before, a Council of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops (that is, within twelve of the number now assembled) had condemned the adoration of images in the east:‡‡ and Pope Adrian, in his letter read in this Nicene Synod, affirms, "that all the people of the east had erred (as he miscalls it) before Constantine and his mother Irene began to reign,"§§ which was but about seven years before; and it is plain there were but few of the bishops who had condemned image-worship, who recanted in this Council of Nice. And the party was so strong at that time in Constantinople, that they forced the Synod to break up, and defer their meeting a

* Act. 6. p. 407. D. † Ibid. p. 411. ‡ Ep. 1. Greg. p. 19. A.

§ Act. 6. p. 427. E. *ibid.* || Act. 6. p. 522. E.

¶ Act. 4. p. 263. B. ** Act. 6. p. 455. A. & Act. 7. p. 586. C.

†† Act. 7. p. 590. B. C. ‡‡ Præfat. ad Concil. 7. p. 5. B. et p. 7 A

§§ Act. 2. p. 99. E.

whole year; after which time they removed to Nice, for fear, of violence from the numbers which were against images;* which party, within a few years after, prevailed with this very Constantine to revoke the constitutions of this Nicene Council.† As for the West and North, we shall in due place make it evident, that in France, Germany, and Britain, this Council was utterly rejected as no General Council, and of no authority at all, though it was confirmed by the Pope. Insomuch that the Franks' objections, which Adrian replies to, say, "these Fathers did rashly and unwarily anathematize the catholic Church, which worshiped no images;" and do observe, "that they should first have inquired what was the sense of every part of the Church in this matter:"‡ wherefore their brag of universal consent is notoriously false.

Again; nothing is more common with them, than to mince the matter and say, "they retain images only for history and commemoration:"§ yet they made the bishops who recanted, profess, "they did embrace and salute images, and give them honorary worship;"|| and they also determine, "we must salute and embrace them, and give them due worship or adoration:"¶ and to make all sure, the Pope's legate causeth an image of Christ to be brought into the Council, and all of them were humbly to kneel before it, and adore it, as a confirmation of their opinion and decrees.**

This Nicene Synod very magisterially reproves the former Council, which condemned image-worship, for self-flattery, and for taking upon them the title of a General Council, and styling themselves Fathers of the Catholic Church:†† yet they who had forsaken the faith and practice of the ancient Church, and differed at that time from the greater part of Christians, do at the beginning of every action, call their assembly an holy and General Council;‡‡ and every where ascribe to themselves the title of the Catholic Church: nor can there be vainer flattery found any where, than one of them gives to this despicable Council, in an oration made at the close thereof:§§ so that they who could see a mote in their brethren's eye, did not, or would not, discern the beam in their own.

* Præfat. p. 38, et 39.

† Platina in Vita Adriani, p. 21. [p. 148. Lond. 1685.]

‡ Epist. Adrian. p. 938. D. § Act. 6. p. 459. D. & p. 523. C. & alibi.

|| Act. 1. p. 55. D. ¶ Act. 6. p. 39. C. B. ** Act. 5. p. 387. D.

†† Act. 6. p. 526. B. ‡‡ Act. 1. p. 39. C. Act. 2. p. 95. C. &c.

§§ Act. 8. p. 6, 7. 618.

Finally, it is very remarkable, that Pope Adrian, in his letter to the Emperor of Constantinople, wheedles him to restore images, by promising him great prosperity, and many triumphs over the barbarous people; affirming, "that Charles the Great, of France, by obeying his admonition, and fulfilling his will in all things, had subdued all the barbarous nations of the West, and brought them under his command:"* which manifest falsehood could pass nowhere, but at so great a distance as Constantinople. For it is well known Charles the Great did not obey the Pope's monition, nor fulfil his will in this very point of images; but called a Council to condemn these decrees of Nice, and sent his objections against them to Rome; which put poor Adrian hard to it, to patch up something that might look like an answer to those objections. Wherefore his prosperity was not the effect of his zeal for image-worship, nor of his reverence for the Pope's authority. To conclude; what credit can we give to a company of men, who make no scruple to say and unsay; to affirm the greatest falsehoods, and deny the plainest truths; yea, and contradict themselves to serve an interest, and to please the Pope, and the Empress Irene.

CHAP. IV.

Of their proofs for Image-worship taken out of holy Scripture.

WHEN a Pope writes in a doctrinal matter, and a General Council approves the epistle, a man might expect most accurate and infallible† expositions of Scripture: for if the infallible interpreter do not with a Council expound infallibly, who can? But in Adrian's letter read and ratified, the adoration of images is proved from Scriptures that are nothing to that purpose: for he quotes Heb. xi. 21, and tells us, "Jacob worshipped on the top of his staff;" which he expounds of Joseph's staff; adding, "that it was not the staff he worshipped (take heed of that), but him that bore it, to whom he shewed this respect and love:"‡ but if the place be searched, there appears nothing but that Jacob worshipped God; and being aged and infirm, could not bow down without leaning over the top of his own staff.

* Act. 2. p. 118. E. & 119. A.

† A Treatise of Fallibility, ch. 5. p. 73, &c.

‡ Act. 2. p. 107. C.

Again, from God's commanding Moses to make two cherubims over the mercy-seat (though he expressly forbid the Jews to worship the likeness of any thing in heaven above; and though these cherubims never were worshipped, nor so much as seen by that people, being behind a veil in the most holy place), Pope Adrian infers, Christians may make and adore images,* though they have no command, as Moses had, to make them; and though they are forbidden, as well as the Jews were, to worship them. The logic of which inference is very notable: and yet this topping proof of Scripture is cited over and over in many places of this eminent Council.† The rest of his proofs from Scripture are these: "Honour and majesty are in his presence," Psal. xcvi. 6. "Thy face will I seek," Psal. xxvii. 8. "The rich among the people shall entreat thy favour, or pray before thy face," Psal. xlv. 12. And "Lord lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us," Psal. iv. 6.‡ All which places he most impertinently applies to the worship paid to the images of God and Christ; whereas they are spoken by David, with respect to the Jewish way of worshipping God in the temple, the place of his especial presence: so that they who came thither, are said to be before God, or by an Hebraism, before his face. But it is well known that no image of God, nor shape, was ever set up there: so that if coming to a temple to worship God, without an image or visible representation, be the same thing with coming to a church to worship God with and by images; then this infallible interpreter of Scripture is a good expositor of all these places.

A little after, John, the Eastern legate, grossly abuseth that excellent prophecy of our Saviour's incarnation: "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other," Psal. lxxxv. 10, by applying it to the agreement between Adrian and Tarasius, and the embraces which justice (that is, the Roman Church) gave the Empress Irene (that is peace);§ the wit of which flattering allusion will not excuse the blasphemy of the application.

In the fourth action, the whole Council makes a great show of proving their doctrine by Scripture: and yet they can find nothing there, but first, the command to Moses to make the two cherubims:|| which we have shewed is not at all to the

* Act. 2. p. 107. D.

† Act. 4. p. 198. B. C. et alibi passim.

‡ Act. 2. p. 110. B. C.

§ Act. 2. p. 130. A. B.

|| Act. 4. p. 198. B.

purpose. Secondly, they tell us, "Moses heard a voice from between the cherubims, when he went to consult the Lord," Numb. vii. 89. But did Moses worship the cherubims? or do they hear the voice of the Lord from their dumb images? If not, why do they cite this place? Thirdly, but they say, "Ezekiel had a vision of a temple adorned with cherubims and palm-trees," Ezek. xl. 1. If any real consequence can be drawn from this imaginary temple, it is only this, "that churches may be adorned;" but how doth this prove that images are to be adored? The former we grant; but it is the latter which they were to prove, and should have shewed us that Ezekiel kneeled to, kissed and prayed to those cherubims and palm-trees, and they had said something. Fourthly, they give us St. Paul's description of the old tabernacle, "in which were the cherubims of glory, and the mercy-seat," Heb. ix, reasoning from thence, "that as the Old Testament had cherubims over the mercy-seat; so that under the New Testament there must be images of Christ over the altar."* I reply; if it were so, still we might argue, "that as in the Old Testament they did not adore those cherubims; so under the New we must not adore these images." But indeed there is no consequence can be drawn from what was in the old tabernacle, to what must be in Christian churches; for then we must have bloody sacrifices, and many other abrogated rites. And St. Paul in that very place affirms, "those were figures for the time present, ver. 9, imposed on them until the time of reformation," ver. 10. Yea, his argument supposes a mighty difference betwixt their carnal and our spiritual worship: so that this proof also is wholly impertinent. And can they imagine such thin and insignificant inferences as these should balance a plain command of the moral law; which expressly charges us to make no image of any thing to worship it? That golden wedge will weigh down all their consequences, if they could rake together ten times as many abused places as they have here done.

Who can sufficiently admire the deep reach of Theodosius, a bishop in this Council, who proves the worship of images by that place of St. Paul, Rom. xv. 4: "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning;"† for he notably observes, "that holy and venerable images, and pictures as well as material writing, are for our learning." But

* Ibid. p. 199. A. B.

† Act. p. 4. 214. A.

doth St. Paul bid us adore these old writings ? doth he enjoin us to offer incense, gifts, and prayers to them ? No doubt, common writings, such as Livy and Tacitus, were written for our learning ; and so are the old carvings upon Roman arches, and the pictures of profane history ; but I hope it doth not follow we are therefore to venerate or worship these. As for the historical use of pictures, we do not deny it : but we cannot allow that was any part of the Apostle's meaning here, where he speaks of Old Testament examples, which God left in writing, not in painting or in carved work ; and he took writing to be the far better way to instruct us.

Leontius Cyprius, who lived not above 200 years before this Council, is cited here with applause : where he adds a long passage (as it were in Scripture), to the history of Joseph's coat being brought to Jacob, saying, "He kissed it with tears, and laid it on his eyes ;" not loving or honouring the garment, but Joseph by it : whence he would prove we must shew the love and honour we have for Christ and the martyrs, unto their images.* To which it suffices to answer here, that this author hath forgot that woe in the Revelation pronounced against all that shall add to the words of God's book, Rev. xxii. 18, there being not one word of this in the original, nor in any authentic version ; and for the argument, we shall meet with it afterwards.

The ingenuity of Tarasius is very visible in citing a place where Jeremiah was complaining of the Jews for worshipping idols, calling it, "forsaking God, the fountain of living waters, and hewing out unto themselves broken cisterns, which can hold no water," Jer. xi. [ii.] 13. And this he makes a prophecy of those Christians, who would not adore any images.† But Theodoret doubtless is a better interpreter, who tells us, images may well be compared to cisterns, being made with hands ; and to broken cisterns, because as they have no good in themselves, so they can neither hold nor convey it to others. And would any leave a fountain that always had, and even sent out water in abundance, for these broken cisterns ?‡ And so also doth Optatus Milevitanus expound the place :§ wherefore this will prove a prophecy of these image-worshippers, who leave the spiritual worship of God, and worship the work of their own hands, and the patriarch is caught in his own net.

* Act. 4. p. 238. C. D.

† Act. 5. p. 347. C.

‡ Theodoret. in locum. [vol. 2. p. 413. Hal. 1770.]

§ Optat. Milev. lib. 4. p. 81. [p 77. Par. 1702.]

That Christian,* who is brought in disputing with a Jew that was very much scandalized at their images, seems to be hard put to it: for when the Jew urges him with the second commandment, expressly forbidding to make any image or likeness of any thing to worship it: the Christian is forced to alter the words of the law, and say, "It only forbids us to worship any new god, and the likeness of any thing as God:"† which addition of his own to God's law shews, that they will alter Scripture rather than change their opinion. Yea, afterwards the Council wonders anybody will apply words to the Christians, which were spoken so long ago to the Jews;‡ which is no less than abrogating the moral law.

In the next action, these Fathers produce two places of Scripture to prove, that looking upon images is as ancient in the Church, and as useful as hearing the Gospel. The first is, "Let me see thy countenance, let me hear thy voice, for sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance comely," Cantic. ii. 14. Which is so ridiculous, that it needs no confutation; only we may note, these are the words of Christ to the Church, whom he calls his dove; see ver. 10. And therefore are by no means to be applied as a speech of the Church's to Christ; and it is a bold thing to suppose we see Christ's face as plainly in an image, as we hear his words when the Gospel is read. Their second proof is, "Like as we have heard, so have we seen," Ps. xlviii. 7.§ And truly this may be a proof of anything that can be heard and seen; it may prove a fly as useful as a learned oration: but the meaning of the place is quite another thing: for God's people say, "As they had heard of his promises to defend his Church, so they had seen him defend it," as appears by the next words, "in the city of our God: God upholdeth the same for ever." But doubtless we may both hear and see what admirable sense a Pope and Council can find in holy Scripture, by their rare exposition of this place.

If the holy text will not justify the doctrines, they have a curious art of enlarging it: for they tell us, "The saints departed know that, according to the Apostle, they are dissolved, and are with Christ, and intercede for us;" and they cite for this, Phil. 1. 23.|| by which an unwary reader might think

* V. Treatise of Fallibility, c. 3. p. 39, &c. c. 5. p. 67.

† Act. 5. p. 355. C.

‡ Act. 6. p. 467. E.

§ Act. 6. p. 407. B.

|| Act. 6. p. 462. D.

that St. Paul there maintained the invocation of saints, the grand pillar of image-worship. But if we consider the place, the Apostle confutes the very intercession of the saints there. For St. Paul (who doubtless was a saint) could have wished to be in heaven, but only that he saw he could do his Philippians more good by staying upon earth; and because he preferred their profit before his own pleasure, he was content to live with them still: which shews that the Apostle knew nothing of his being to be a mediator or intercessor for them in heaven; for if he had, he could not have affirmed it was better for them that he should continue in this mortal state.

The next instance shews their diligence in reading Scripture; for they cite an obvious place of St. Peter, 2 Epist. iii. 16, in this manner, "The unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures according to their own lusts." Whereas St. Peter's words are, "—— wrest, as they do also other Scriptures, to their own destruction."* Yet, as they have cited the place, it plainly belongs to them, rather than their adversaries; for they have given very many instances of their wresting Scripture to make it serve their lust of promoting image-worship.

It seems to argue they had no great share of modesty in that they account themselves that Church of Christ of which St. Paul speaks, Ephes. v. 27, "which was the spouse of Christ, without spot or wrinkle."† But besides their many evident spots or wrinkles, sufficient to confute this vain application, St. Augustine informs us, "that the Church without spot or wrinkle, is not to be understood as if it were so now, but that it is now preparing, that it may be so against it is to appear in glory;"‡ and (I doubt not) he will be thought a better interpreter of this place than they.

But there is nothing backed with more proofs from Scripture than a peculiar notion of theirs, which is as weak as their testimonies for it are impertinent, *viz.* that after Christ had once redeemed Christians from idolatry, it was impossible that they should ever relapse into that crime; which they would collect from God's promising the Jews "to blot out the names of idols from under heaven," Zech. xiii.; which promise was actually performed to that people after their captivity; and from God's kingdom being an "everlasting kingdom," Psalm cxlv; and his "gifts and calling being without repent-

* Act. 6. p. 463. D.

† Act. 7. p. 551. E.

‡ Aug. Retract. lib. 2. cap. 18. [vol. 1. p. 48. Par. 1679.]

ance,"* Rom. xi. The same inference they make elsewhere, from St. Luke i. 75, where Christ is said "to deliver us from our enemies, that we might serve him in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life;" and from God's "smiting his enemies in the hinder parts, and putting them to a perpetual shame," Psalm lxxviii. 66.† To all which I answer, if this did secure the whole Church from a possibility of relapsing into idolatry, it doth not secure one corrupt part of it. And though Christ hath done his part completely, yet this will not prove that all men shall always do their parts. For at this rate of arguing, no single person or number of men could possibly fall into any sins or false opinions. And thus we may prove none, who are redeemed by Christ, can become heretics, apostates, drunkards, or whoremongers; nor can I see how they are more secured from idolatry than from any other error or crime.

To conclude: it is very visible all along, that they have no mind their doctrine should be tried by Scripture, as believing it was not on their side: for they obliged Basilins, when he made his recantation, to anathematize those who say, "they will not receive any doctrine upon the bare authority of Fathers and Councils, unless it be plainly taught in the Old and New Testament."‡ Which wise and orthodox resolution we are taught by many holy Fathers, who charge us to believe nothing in matters of faith but what may be proved out of holy Scripture. Yet these gentlemen call this, taking up the words of Eutyches and Dioscorus. However, this is a tacit confession Scripture is against them; and therefore they are the first Council "which expressly accursed all that reject ecclesiastical tradition, written or unwritten."§ And when they are pinched with objections from the holy text, they fly out into a long harangue against Scripture, crying out, "That all the patrons of heresy take occasion for their errors from the divinely inspired Scriptures."|| But we may well except the patrons of image-worship; for they have used all the shifts imaginable, and yet cannot find any one place of Scripture to graft their error upon, and therefore they fly to universal traditions; which how rarely they make out, shall be examined in the next chapter.

* Act. 6. p. 402. E. 403. A.

† Act. 1. p. 58. A.

|| Act. 6. p. 463. C. D.

† Act. 7. p. 587. C.

§ Act. 8. p. 594. A.

CHAP. V.

Of their Proofs from Antiquity and Tradition.

THE Scriptures cited in this Council were only to flourish with ; for the main ground they go upon is tradition. And though they often affirm this practice of image-worship came down to them from the preaching of the Apostles, yet they grant it is not in any of their writings : for they say the making of images was delivered to them from the Apostles by an unwritten tradition.* And elsewhere they brag this doctrine and practice had continued almost eight hundred years ; † that is, from the time of Christ and his Apostles. But there is no proof of this offered in all the Council, except this, “ That we may know it by the old pictures to be seen in churches.” ‡ Now can any man in his wits believe there were any churches then standing, or any pictures made in them, which remained in the year 787, that had been built or painted in the Apostles’ days ; especially if it be remembered that Christianity was persecuted for three hundred years together. So that if we will take their word for it (who have given such specimens of their integrity, chap. iii.), we may believe it if we please ; and knowing they cannot prove it, they would have us take it on trust, telling us it is really an ancient ecclesiastical tradition ; but withal charging us, “ not to search too narrowly ; nor inquire too busily into this pious custom and ancient law ; ” § and a very little search will shew the weakness of this pretence.

For in the next place it is affirmed, “ That all the six preceding Councils had established the adoration of images.” || Yet afterwards Pope Gregory confesses, “ there is no more in those Councils about this matter, than about eating bread and drinking water.” ¶ And it is certain there was not one word about images in five of those General Councils, because these zealots for them do not cite one word out of them for any use of images, no not when they were urged to do it. And for that canon of the sixth Council (mentioned before) it was not made a full hundred years before this Nicene Council ; and it only gives licence to picture our Saviour for the time to come in a human form, who before was wont to be represented by a lamb.

* Act. 6. p. 451. C.

† Act. 8. p. 617. D.

‡ Act. 6. p. 403. E.

§ Act. 6. p. 539. A.

|| Ep. Gregorii, p. 10. D. Act. 6. p. 431. C.

¶ Ep. Gregor. p. 27. D.

and this only for memory sake, but not a syllable of any adoration;* which really disproves their pretence of all the six General Councils, and shews that the very picturing of Christ in human form was a late thing; and that the adoring that picture or image was never decreed in any one of the six Councils. And this is plainly owned by the Patriarch Germanus, who in his original epistle saith, "The General Councils everywhere received, had made canons about many things of less moment than images; and it is not (saith he) probable they would have left this point undiscussed and undetermined, if the adoring images had led to that idolatry which is condemned in Scripture."† Now it is enough to answer this weak insinuation to say, "What was not practised, could not be condemned." But my main business is to observe, that a patron of image-worship grants these Councils said nothing of adoring images; which shews the failing of their pretended tradition: and it is very plain that this passage was against the sense of the Roman Church, and therefore both the Latin versions labour to corrupt it. Anastasius translates it most falsely thus: "The General Councils every where received, which have laid down rules in several chapters concerning images,"‡ &c. And the old Latin version with less sincerity still saith, "That though in these General Councils many canons were made for images, yet none appeared for abrogating them."§ Both which translations contradict the Greek of Germanus's epistle, and the truth also; and the attempt of the translators to corrupt this place, declares that the Roman Church hath long since had the art of making old authors speak their own sense; but still it is plain that image-worship was not established by all or any of these six General Councils.

Again, we may be confident that they have no good proofs from genuine antiquity, because they fly to fabulous narrations and spurious tracts for evidence of this pretended tradition.

So Pope Gregory cites the Epistle of Abgarus to our Saviour,|| which was condemned as fabulous and apocryphal by his predecessor Pope Gelasius, in a Council at Rome,¶ and is rejected at this day by most of the learned writers of that Church. The Council also cites a canon of a Council held by the Apostles at Antioch; in which, "lest the faithful should err any more about idols, they appoint them to make

* Act. 4. p. 234. A.

† Act. 4. p. 306. D.

‡ Ibid. in versione Latin.

§ Versio antiq. p. 779. C.

|| Ep. Greg. p. 14. B. ¶ Conc. 1. Rom. sub Gelasio, [vol. 4. p. 1265.]

the statue of our Lord Jesus Christ, both God and man ”* Which Council and canon are of their own devising, and attested by no credible author. Pope Adrian cites a notorious fable of the images of the Apostles shewed to Constantine the Great by Pope Sylvester, who had fled to Mount Soracte for fear of Constantine’s persecution, and was now pretended to be called back from thence.† Yet it is most certain there was no persecution at all in the time of Sylvester ; for Constantine was become a professed Christian in the time of Miltiades, his predecessor ; whom the Emperor had constituted the judge of Cæcilianus’ cause,‡ and (as Romish authors affirm) he had given that Lateran palace, and divers noble gifts to Rome, in the days of this Miltiades.§ How then can it be likely Constantine should afterwards turn persecutor again in the days of Sylvester ? or need a new miracle to convert him ? But the story served the present turn, and so it was all one whether it were true or false. Again, the Council produces a relation of the bleeding of an image of our Saviour, and the conversion of many Jews thereupon, which they father upon Athanasius the Great.|| But the whole passage is proved fabulous by a learned author of ours,¶ and Nannius, a doctor of Louvain, who first digested Athanasius’s works into tomes, put this among the spurious pieces. Yea, Bellarmine himself affirms this sermon was not the work of the famous Athanasius, but of a much later author : “ For,” saith he, “ Sigebert, in his Chronicle, relates this miracle as done but in the year 766, that is only twenty years before this Council of Nice.”** And the whole story smells so strong of the legend, that we may well believe there never was any such thing. But it was a late invention of the image-worshippers to countenance their doctrine, and by the inventors published under a great name to gain credit to it. There are many more passages cited as testimonies of antiquity, which are most incredible fables, worthy of derision rather than a serious confutation. Such are those legends quoted out of Sophronius of Jerusalem, who died about the year 636, about which time the sixth General Council complains, that “ many

* Act. 3. [Ib. vol. 7.] p. 63. C.

† Act. 2. p. 102. E.

‡ Optat. Milev. l. 1. [ut supra, p. 24.] etc. Euseb. Hist. l. 10. c. 5. [p. 391. Par. 1659.]

§ Binii not. in Vit. Miltiadas, tom. 1. par. 2. p. 209. A.

|| Act. 4. p. 218. B.

¶ Riveti Critic. Sac. l. 3. c. 6. [p. 1105. col. 1. Roterod. 1652.]

** Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. in Athan. p. 52.

had filled up the lives of the martyrs with feigned stories ;”* of which kind we may well reckon that ridiculous tale concerning a certain hermit, who swore to the devil not to reveal his advice, which was, not to worship any more an image which he kept in his cell.† But yet afterwards he informs his confessor what counsel the devil had given him, who gravely and piously declares, that “the hermit had better go into every bawdy-house in the city, than neglect to worship the images of Christ and the blessed Virgin.”‡ Which excellent divinity and rare history pleased the Fathers of this Council so well, that they cite it again in the next act,§ and make many notable remarks upon it, as a famous evidence of the agreement of the Fathers concerning image-worship ;|| whereas the most of these relations are but about one hundred or one hundred and fifty years older than this Council ; and so cannot make out a tradition, which they pretend had continued for near eight hundred years ; being rather the dreams of superstitious monks, and apocryphal as well as ridiculous fables,¶ than the testimonies of any eminent or genuine Fathers.

As for the places they cite out of approved authors, either they are only about the use of pictures for ornament and history, or they are nothing at all to the purpose, and none of them are sufficient to prove a tradition down from the Apostles’ times. For St. Chrysostom lived near four hundred years after Christ ; and he only saith (if the sermon be his), “that some people, out of their affection to their bishop Meletius, procured his picture, and hung it up to keep him in their memory.”** But he speaks of no adoration paid either to this picture, or to that of the angel destroying the Assyrians in their tents ; he calls it, indeed, a pious representation, and saith, he was pleased with it.†† So Gregory Nyssen was much affected with a picture of Abraham’s offering up his son Isaac.‡‡ And no doubt many Protestants are much pleased with good pictures of Scripture-history, and yet never intend to worship or adore them : for they grant with St. Cyril, that “it is lawful to describe any historical passage in Scripture in a picture.”§§ But what is all this to their purpose ? They tell us that Gre-

* Conc. 6. Constant. Can. 63. [vol. 6. p. 1172.]

† V. Treatise of the Fallibility of the Roman Church, pref. p. 5, 6.

‡ Act. 4. p. 250. D. E.

§ Act. 5. p. 382. A.

|| Act. 4. p. 254. B. and Act. 5. p. 383. C.

¶ Epist. Adriani ad Carol. M. p. 939. D.

** Act. 4. p. 202. A.

†† Ibid. p. 202. C.

‡‡ Ibid. p. 206. B.

§§ Ibid. p. 206. B.

gory Nazianzen relates, how “a lewd woman was reformed by seriously viewing the picture of a reverend and virtuous old man.” And no doubt the sight of his person would have had a more certain effect; yet none can infer from thence, that she had been obliged to worship his person; nor doth the Father say any thing of her adoring his picture.* The woman who was cured of an issue of blood, made a statue of Christ, after the Romans’ custom, who used this way to express their gratitude to their benefactors:† but there is no mention that she or others adored this statue; and if the Christians had done so in that age, they could not have accused the heathens for worshipping their images. Asterius Amasenus lived after the year 400, and he only rhetorically describes the picture of St. Euphemia’s passion, which he saw in one of the porticos of the Church, and saith that the painter was piously employed when he drew this picture,‡ no doubt more piously than if he had been painting a profane story: but still we do not find that the Father prayed to this figure; and this is the first instance they can bring of a picture hung up in or near a church. So that probably about this time they came to be used to adorn churches. For it is most improbable, which a certain legend afterwards affirms, that there were pictures of saints in Christian churches in the times while persecution raged;§ and we are assured of the contrary by far better authority.|| It was therefore in the fifth century that this adorning of churches came in, as may be collected from that question put to Nilus (who lived about 445), concerning painting churches or oratories: and he advises them to have (not a rood-loft full of saints, but) only the bare sign of the cross in the east end, and saith, the other walls should rather be adorned with histories of the Old and New Testament, than with horses, dogs, and hares, and such-like vain pictures;¶ but in him we hear nothing of adoring either the cross or other pictures.

The next order of testimonies are out of authors living six hundred years after Christ, in an age when ignorance and superstition grew apace, and therefore they are no good evidence for a tradition, pretended to be derived from the Apostles.

* Ibid. p. 206. D.

† Ibid. p. 207. B.

‡ Ibid. p. 207. D.

§ Act. 4. p. 214. C.

|| Baluzii not. ad Lactant. de Mort. persecut. p. 374.

¶ Act. 4. p. 227. B.

Maximus died not much above one hundred years before this Council.* And in him we first meet with kissing the cross and the image of Christ, as well as the Gospels, in the taking of an oath:† but the Fathers of this Council stretch this too far, when they affirm this was adoration; for those who utterly deny, that any adoration is due to the Gospels, will yet kiss the book when they take a solemn oath. Leontius Cyprius is an obscure author, and some think this tract was never heard of before this Council; however, he lived but in the year 620,‡ and therefore is too late for an evidence in this cause: he seems indeed to speak the most home to the adoration; but his authority weighs not against many elder and more learned Fathers; and his arguments shall be examined afterwards.§ Their next witness Anastasius, bishop of Antioch, lived in the seventh century, and yet is no favourer of their cause; for he allows no more honour to be given to angels, than we give to men; and expressly declares, “we must not pray to them, that being a service only due to God:”|| and how this will agree to the praying to saints and angels, in and by images, as the Romanists daily do, I cannot imagine. Besides, he makes it ridiculous to adore the emperor’s image, when he himself is present;¶ yet Christ hath assured us, he is present always, when we assemble in his name; and he hath promised to be with us unto the end of the world; and therefore it is as ridiculous to adore his image. For as Lactantius argues, “Since God cannot be absent, but by his divine nature he hears and sees all things in every part of the world, it is needless to make an image of him, that is everywhere present; and since he hears us, it is enough to call upon his name in prayer.”** As for Sophronius of Jerusalem, he is too late, as was noted before, for he died in the year 636.†† Yet he names no custom of adoring or praying to the images of the saints, though he speaks of building churches to their memory; and shews the great advances which superstition had made in adorning churches.‡‡ And his very silence about adoration is a good proof that no such thing was in use at that time.

Finally, as if they relied not much on these later witnesses,

* Ann. 660. Bellarm. de Script. Eccl. p. 113.

† Act. 4. p. 331. B.

‡ Ann. 620. Bellarm. de Script. Eccl. p. 111.

§ Act. 4. p. 235. B. || Act. 4. p. 247. A.

¶ Ibid. E.

** Lactantii Instit. lib. 2. cap. 2. [vol. 1. p. 117. Lut. Par. 1748.]

†† Chartophyl. Eccles. p. 128.

‡‡ Act. 4. p. 250. C.

they run back again to some more eminent and ancient Fathers, but still to no purpose. The first place cited out of St. Chrysostom, is not to be found in the best edition of his works; but if it were, his arguing that all creatures have a natural reverence for man as he is the image of God,* will be little for the credit of their images, which dogs will piss upon, and birds defile; yea, which mice and worms make bold with. The following citations out of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, are good evidence against the worship of the image of Christ in their time; for they only argue for the worship of Christ himself, and shew, that he being the image of God, in worshipping him, we worship God; and this they illustrate by the civil honour paid to the emperor's image, which is shewed for the emperor's sake. But if there had been any custom then of worshipping Christ's image with religious worship, that had been a far more proper illustration for their argument, than the other;† and there could not have been a fitter occasion to mention the adorning Christ by his image than this. Wherefore their silence in that point, and their flying to a remote comparison, relating only to civil honour, doth prove, that in their time the image of Christ was not adored with religious worship. The next citation out of St. Basil, is out of a forged epistle of his to Julian the Apostate;‡ which is so gross, that some of the Romanists are ashamed of it; and the very style sufficiently discovers it.§ And no doubt if St. Basil had writ so plainly to Julian, about the Christians adoring images, that witty and malicious adversary of theirs would have made use of this to justify his pagan idolatry; whereas in all his works he never objects this, but blames them as enemies to all images. The testimony of Theodoret, about setting up the image of Symeon Stylites over their shop-doors at Rome, hoping for protection from thence,|| confutes the pretence of Pope Gregory and the Council, that they did not hope and trust in images;¶ and no doubt it was a crime in the people who did so, if the story be true: but let it be remembered, that Theodoret brings it in with "they say," as being only a report; and he lived a great way from Rome, and so might be easily imposed on in this matter. They add another place out of St. Basil's sermon on Balaam; which (if it be genuine) is nothing

* Ibid. p. 259.

† Ibid. p. 262. A. D. & 263. A.

‡ Act. 4. p. 263. C. D.

§ Dr. Cave's *Life of St. Basil*, p. 222.

|| Act. 4. p. 266. A.

¶ Ep. Gregor. p. 14. E. & Act. 6. p. 411. B.

to their purpose of adoration, being only a rhetorical flourishing kind of advice to a painter : and many thousands hold it lawful to draw a picture of our Saviour, who utterly refuse to worship it.* In the next act, St. Cyril justly condemns Nebuchadnezzar, for the sacrilege of taking away the cherubims out of the temple.† But what is this to a Christian emperor's taking away images, which were not set in churches by God's command (as the cherubims were in the temple), and which were abused to superstition and idolatry (but so were not the cherubims). If St. Cyril had blamed Hezekiah for breaking the brazen serpent, it had been somewhat to the purpose, and their application had been very proper. As for the epistle of Symeon Stylites, it was writ to that Justin the emperor, who died in the year 578. So that it is too late to witness their Apostolical tradition ; and besides, he saith not one word of any worship paid to the images of Christ and his mother, by the Christians ; which is the point they were to prove. Nor ought his authority to be much considered, if we observe how little charity this angry saint had, who urges the emperor to destroy those Samaritans without any mercy, who had no mercy on the images ; and curses them to the pit of hell,‡ though Christ hath charged us to " bless, and curse not."

And now we see how they have made out their catholic tradition, for the veneration of images, which came (they say) from the preaching of the Apostles, and had been received for near eight hundred years, being the doctrine of all preceding Councils and Fathers. And yet not one Council or Father mentions images, till about three hundred years after Christ ; and after that for three hundred years more they were only used for ornament and history ; but the adoration is proved by a heap of legends and spurious authorities, or by writers who lived but a very little while before this Council.

* Act. 4. p. 271. A.

† Act. 5. p. 347. E.

‡ Act. 5. p. 350. E. &c.

